



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 19, 2015

No. 77

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOST).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

May 19, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE BOST to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, last week, The Washington Post ran a story titled, "Defense Firm that Employed Drunk, High Contractors in Afghanistan May Have Wasted \$135 Million in Taxpayer Dollars," by Colby Itkowitz. Colby writes:

"The defense contractor investigated in 2012 after cellphone videos surfaced of its employees drunk and high on drugs in Afghanistan may have mis-

used almost \$135 million of U.S. taxpayer money, an audit finds."

The Hill further reported that:

"The company also did not comply with Federal procurement law, the audit found."

Mr. Speaker, I have been coming down to this floor for weeks to highlight the waste, fraud, and abuse in Afghanistan, which John Sopko, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, has reported is worse now than ever.

The National Defense Authorization Act, which the House passed last week, authorized \$42 billion for Afghanistan, which is one of the reasons I did not vote for the bill.

Why do we continue to spend billions of American taxpayer dollars in Afghanistan when infrastructure all over the United States is rapidly deteriorating? This past weekend, CBS' "60 Minutes" ran a segment on America's failing infrastructure and reported that 70,000 bridges in the United States have been deemed structurally deficient, according to the Federal Government. That is one bridge out of every nine. My constituents in eastern North Carolina continually experience frustration and concern over the Bonner Bridge, which is falling apart. This further highlights the waste and the failed policy in Afghanistan.

I know some Members of Congress will be upset that I am calling attention to the reckless spending in Afghanistan the NDAA authorized, but then why doesn't Congress stop sending billions of dollars to a failed state where young American men and women are being wounded and killed? Mr. Speaker, this includes the father of these two little girls who are on a poster beside me. Their names are Eden and Stephanie Balduf. Their daddy, Sergeant Kevin Balduf, was shot and killed in Afghanistan 2 years ago by the Afghan he was training.

Mr. Speaker, it just gets worse and worse. Those wasted billions of dollars

should be allocated to fix American bridges and roads from falling apart and endangering American citizens. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the American people that, last year, the Obama administration signed a 10-year bilateral security agreement with Afghanistan strapping us with 10 more years of waste, fraud, and abuse; 10 more years of billions of dollars being wasted; 10 more years of young Americans being killed and wounded while the infrastructure in America is collapsing; 10 more years of veterans worrying about their benefits. There are so many needs here in America, so many needs that are not being met because we are wasting money overseas in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should debate and vote to stop the madness in Afghanistan on behalf of our soldiers and our men and women in uniform, their families, and the taxpayers of America.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said many times that Afghanistan is a graveyard of empires. I hope there is a headstone for America because that is where we are heading, to the graveyard in Afghanistan.

### TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, after a rocky start this Congress, we have seen some signs of progress.

Earlier this session, the House leadership allowed the process to work when all Democrats joined many Republicans to rescue Homeland Security from the potential disastrous shutdown by cutting off funds.

Later, a decade-long struggle on the Medicare sustainable growth rate, the so-called doc fix, moved forward. An impasse that had lasted for years was

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3313

broken, and the solution was overwhelmingly approved by Members of both parties.

Well, now, we are facing yet another impasse, one that has haunted us far longer than a decade, transportation funding. The authority to spend for surface transportation programs expires May 31.

Just as I predicted last summer, the stopgap approach that we approved then would put us right back in the same spot this spring, cutting badly needed transportation projects this summer and the jobs that go with them.

America is falling apart and falling behind in part because you cannot pay for 2015 transportation needs with 1993 dollars, which was the last time we raised the gas tax. Thirty-two short-term funding extensions are evidence of a bipartisan failure for these 22 years to deal with the gas tax, and there is no meaningful alternative for transportation resources on the horizon.

Ironically, the solution is clear, thoroughly studied and broadly supported: raise the gas tax for the first time since 1993. The House Republican leadership doesn't have to do anything extraordinary, just allow the Ways and Means Committee to follow regular order. Let's listen to the experts; invite the stakeholders that build, maintain, and use our transportation system.

Listen to the heads of the AFL-CIO, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, leaders in transit, truckers, AAA, bicyclists, all of whom agree with President Eisenhower, who used the gas tax to start the highway trust fund and the interstate freeway system, and President Ronald Reagan, who increased gas tax a nickel, more than doubling it in 1992.

In fact, we can invite legislators from today. Six red Republican States have raised the gas tax already this year: Nebraska, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Utah, and South Dakota. State Senator Michael Vehle comes to mind.

The key is to have real hearings, like Congress used to conduct. Have a full week devoted to solving the transportation funding crisis. Bring in the witnesses, grill them, test their thoughts and theories, discuss real solutions, not gimmicks or ideologically driven fantasies.

Let's have serious work sessions and a markup. President Obama could help by establishing a marker that he will approve no further extensions past September 31.

It will not be less complex, expensive, or easier politically in 2016, 2017, or 2018. If this slides until 2016, which is the approach evidently favored by the Republican leadership, we will be struggling with this in the next Congress and the next administration.

This does not have to be an exercise in futility. We are seeing the leadership exhibited all across the country with 20 States that have stepped up, and as I mentioned, six red States already this year.

Now is the time for Congress to do its job. In fact, if we do our job, taking the solution that has been thoroughly vetted, studied, and widely supported by interest groups across the political spectrum, we are going to be able to solve this funding conundrum.

We will be able to rebuild and renew America, putting hundreds of thousands of people to work at family-wage jobs, while Congress helps make our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

I strongly urge that the House reject the approach that would simply dodge this problem for 2 more months, then slide to the end of the year and beyond. We should call the question now, establish the parameters.

This is something that is long overdue, that all of us can embrace, and America will be the better for it.

#### MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, the challenges we face today are different from the challenges we faced when Mental Health Awareness Month began decades ago, but now, it is more important than ever that we take time out of our busy schedules to speak about the prevalence of mental illness and understand the importance, as friends, as family members, and as a community, of discussing the common signs of mental illness.

Mr. Speaker, you may be surprised to learn, as I was, that 1 in 5 adults experience mental health problems each year; and, while each illness is unique, there are some common signs that you or a loved one could be suffering from mental illness, like difficulty concentrating or experiencing a change in sleeping habits.

As parents, we must make an effort to talk to our children about their emotions and their mental health, just as we care for our children's physical health, by encouraging them to eat well, get enough sleep, and exercise frequently.

Without a doubt, Mr. Speaker, America is one of the most blessed countries in the world. We are all offered the opportunities for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Raising healthy families, both physically and mentally, is one of the responsibilities that comes with those freedoms.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the more voices we have speaking up about mental health, the better we can eliminate stigma surrounding mental health conditions. The National Alliance on Mental Illness of North Carolina is asking individuals in my home State, North Carolina, to see the person and not the illness and pledge to be stigma-free.

It is time to end the silence and stigma often linked with mental health conditions, and I join them happily in this effort.

#### CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF B.B. KING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, B.B. King, a musical genius, has passed away.

When B.B. King was just a little boy down in Indianola, Mississippi, he stood up in the middle of a cotton field, and he said:

One day, somebody is going to stand up and sing about me and play the guitar about me.

Then he said:

You know, I reckon it will be myself. Yeah, I reckon it will be me.

B.B. King went on to become a worldwide icon of music; and people all over the world, regardless of race, creed, or color, appreciated and loved B.B. King. B.B. King influenced all the great ones, from Frank Sinatra to Elvis Presley; and Elvis Presley loved B.B. King.

Aretha Franklin, Sam Cooke, Eric Clapton, Mick Jagger, even the Beatles and Muddy Waters, Bo Diddley, all of these musical legends were influenced by B.B. King.

□ 1015

B.B. King sung about the deep things of life. He sung about love—love lost and love gained. B.B. King sang, and he played the blues. A unique American cultural, musical genre, B.B. King.

Ladies and gentlemen, you know, B.B. King would say:

Trouble in mind, I'm blue  
But I won't be blue always  
'Cause I know the sun's gonna shine in my  
back door someday  
I am all alone at midnight, and the lights are  
burning low  
But the sun's gonna shine in my back door  
someday.

Mr. Speaker, the great classic of so many classics that he wrote and he sang was "The Thrill is Gone." As he would say, "The thrill is gone away." But, Mr. Speaker, the thrill of B.B. King and his life and his music and his great contributions as a genuine American hero will live on and on for generations to come. B.B. King's music will live on, and Lucille, his guitar, will live on.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, we thank God, Jehovah God Almighty, for sending B.B. King our way.

#### IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, a large and respected Iranian expatriate community has settled in California, and it has been my privilege to get to know some of them in recent years. They are part of an international diaspora of 5 million people who fled Iran after it fell to Islamic fascism 36 years

ago. The stories they tell are blood-curdling.

One woman told of her cousin who had been rounded up in an antigovernment demonstration and taken to prison. After several years, the families were informed that their loved ones were to be released in the town square. When the excited families arrived for their long-awaited reunion, their sons were hanged before their eyes.

A doctor told me of his college days in Paris. He called home to tell his brother in Tehran of an anti-Khomeini demonstration. His brother was promptly arrested, tortured, and imprisoned for simply listening.

Now, a few months ago, after many years of silence, the brother in America received a call from his brother in Iran who wanted to tell him of the simmering unrest going on throughout that country. The American brother told him to shut up, to remember what happened the last time they had spoken so candidly. His brother in Tehran said: "I don't care anymore. They can't arrest all of us."

All of the Iranian expatriates I spoke with tell me the same thing: the economic sanctions and international isolation of the regime were bringing Iran to the brink of revolution.

And this brings us to the President's negotiation with Iran's fascist Islamic regime. Any agreement between Iran's leaders and the United States is meaningless because Iran's leaders' word is meaningless. Iran's government is a notoriously untrustworthy rogue state that has made it unmistakably clear that it intends to acquire nuclear weapons and, once acquired, to use them. The only way to avert this nightmare, short of war, is for the regime to collapse from within.

Over the last several years, the Iranian opposition has grown dramatically for two reasons: there is a strong and growing perception among the Iranian people that the Iranian dictatorship is a pariah in the international community, and the resulting international economic sanctions have created conditions that make the regime's overthrow imperative.

At precisely this moment in history, Barack Obama did incalculable damage by initiating these negotiations. By engaging this rogue state, President Obama has given it international recognition and legitimacy at just that moment when it had lost legitimacy in the eyes of its own people. Worse, by promising relief from economic sanctions, he has removed the most compelling reason the organized Iranian resistance had to justify the regime's overthrow.

It is not the outcome of the negotiations that matters because any agreement with Iran's conniving leaders is meaningless. It is the negotiations, themselves, that have greatly strengthened the regime, just when it was most vulnerable from growing opposition among its own people.

Now, the House just passed H.R. 1191 that purports to restore congressional oversight to these talks. I believe it completely missed the point.

First, our Constitution requires that any treaty be approved by two-thirds of the Senate. Well, that wasn't going to happen, so Mr. Obama simply redefined the prospective treaty as an agreement between leaders, an agreement with no force of law and no legal standing.

I fear the Congress has just changed this equation by establishing a wholly extra-constitutional process that lends the imprimatur of Congress to these negotiations with no practical way to stop the lifting of sanctions. Instead of two-thirds of the Senate having to approve a treaty, as the Constitution requires, this agreement takes effect automatically unless two-thirds of both Houses reject it—a complete sham.

But worse, I fear this bill gives tacit approval to extremely harmful negotiations that Congress, instead, ought to vigorously condemn and unambiguously repudiate.

We can only hope that in the days ahead what Churchill called "the parliamentary democracies" will regain the national leadership required to prevent these negotiations from producing what amounts to the Munich accords for the Middle East. That will require treating the Iranian dictatorship as the international pariah that it is, and it will require providing every ounce of moral and material support to the Iranian opposition that they need to rid their Nation of this fascist Islamic dictatorship, to restore their proud heritage, and to retake their place among the civilized nations of the world.

#### POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mark Twain once said that "action speaks louder than words but not nearly as often."

Since last week's tragic Amtrak accident, we have heard plenty of words about the need for stronger rail safety measures and investments in our infrastructure, but it is time for Congress to back up these words with action. It is time for Congress to put its money where its mouth is.

We know how to prevent tragic accidents like the one that happened on Amtrak last week. We even mandated new technology called positive train control that would have prevented it. But what Congress has refused to do is to pay to actually get it done.

Positive train control is a game-changer for rail safety. The technology would have likely prevented 140 train accidents that have caused more than 280 deaths and \$300 million in property damage since 1969. But this safety technology is also incredibly complex and expensive to implement. We have man-

dated technology that is expected to cost billions, and we are forcing the Nation's railroads to foot the entire bill.

Much of this last week's focus has been on Amtrak, but despite last week's accident, Amtrak is actually on target to implement positive train control by the end of the year.

For the already cash-strapped commuter railroads around the country, it is a completely different story. For them, Congress' refusal to fund positive train control has pretty much stopped implementation in its tracks. Expected to cost commuter railroads nearly \$3.5 billion, it is no wonder that over 70 percent of commuter railroads won't achieve positive train control implementation before this year's deadline.

Our commuter railroads are integral to the daily commute of millions of Americans. In fact, Amtrak's annual ridership pales in comparison to our Nation's commuter railroads. While Amtrak carries 30 million riders a year, commuter railroads carry close to 500 million.

In the Chicago area alone, Metra's ridership last year was over 80 million. With numbers like that, how can Congress justify mandating a policy that they know commuter railroads simply cannot afford while providing very little funding to help them do it?

This unfunded mandate is forcing commuter rails to sacrifice other investments that are crucial to railroad safety and efficiency. Fifty percent of commuter railroads are currently deferring other capital investments to implement positive train control.

And what happens when the commuters aren't able to implement this technology before the end of this year? They get penalized—fined. Instead of giving money to the commuters to pay for PTC, the Federal Government is actually going to end up collecting money from them for not being able to afford to do so.

For good reason, Congress mandated incredibly important and incredibly expensive new technology. But it has amounted to a lot of words and very little action.

The same 2008 law that mandated PTC also authorized \$50 million a year in rail safety technology grants to help Amtrak and commuter railroads pay for this implementation, but in the 7 years since the law was passed, Congress has only appropriated funding once.

Mr. Speaker, \$50 million a year wasn't enough then, and it is sure not enough now. That is why I introduced a bill with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) in March to reauthorize PTC funding at \$200 million a year.

It is time for Congress to finish what it started. It is time for Congress to get serious about investing in our Nation's transportation infrastructure. And it is time for Congress to help our commuter railroads implement positive train control and prevent the kind of

tragedies that we saw on Amtrak last week.

#### RECOGNIZING MAX DEMBY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Max Demby. Mr. Demby is a former congressional intern from my office, a University of Colorado senior, and an outstanding young man of character who was recently recognized by his community and local police for an act of heroism when he stopped a sexual assault in progress on his school campus.

Mr. Demby, who is from Cortez, Colorado, is a dedicated student, pursuing a degree in accounting at CU. He fills his time outside of the classroom with extracurricular activities such as internships and also works as a Ralpie handler at CU, which involves helping to manage the school mascot.

Late one evening, Mr. Demby was walking on campus when he happened to come across what looked to be an attempted sexual assault. Acting with bravery and determination, Mr. Demby took action and ran off the attacker.

Referencing the confrontation with the attacker, Mr. Demby humbly stated: "I was able to be in the right place at the right time and do the right thing." By intervening, Max put himself in harm's way to help the victim, and his act of selflessness drastically reduced the irreparable damage that the criminal was intent on causing.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Demby's selfless act should not go unnoticed. He serves as an admirable example of what young men of character should be. By putting others before himself and by intervening to stop a crime without hesitation, he made his community and campus a safer place.

On behalf of the Third Congressional District and the State of Colorado, I would like to thank Mr. Demby for his selfless act of bravery.

#### HUNGER AMONG SENIORS GROWING IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at the end of March, I had the privilege of spending some time with the Highland Valley Elder Services' Meals on Wheels program in Northampton, Massachusetts, as part of their "March for Meals Month" to raise awareness about senior hunger.

I began my visit in the kitchen at the Walter Salvo Elder House, where an average of 550 healthy meals are prepared from scratch every weekday for delivery to homebound seniors and disabled residents of Hampshire County.

I had the opportunity to chat with Highland Valley director Allan Ouimet and nutrition program director Nancy

Mathers. Then I helped volunteer driver Arthur Mongeon pack up the day's meals in insulated coolers to keep the food hot. This day's meal was home-made chicken covered in gravy, mashed potatoes, green beans, cranberry sauce, applesauce, and milk. The food looked and smelled delicious and reminded me of what my grandmother used to make.

I joined Arthur on his normal N1 route, making stops at 15 homes in Northampton. At each stop, I had the opportunity to deliver the meal and chat with the residents. It was an eye-opening experience, and I thoroughly enjoyed hearing people's stories.

Each meal delivered contains one-third of the daily nutritional recommendations. For many individuals, the meal they receive from Meals on Wheels is the only well-balanced meal they eat all day.

□ 1030

The individuals who receive these meals are low-income and often have significant health challenges that make it simply too difficult to prepare a full meal, never mind going out to the grocery store to shop.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting things I learned from my visit is that Meals on Wheels is so much more than just a meals program. People who are homebound—many, who live alone—look forward to the brief, daily visits from the volunteers. These visits lift their spirits and allow them to socialize, and volunteers can check in and see how they are doing. Because of programs like Meals on Wheels, seniors can stay in their own homes where they are most comfortable and live independently longer.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about food insecurity in this country, nearly everybody talks about children, and we are right to want to do everything we can to end childhood hunger. But lost in that narrative is the reality that, among the food insecure, the rising population is seniors. One in twelve seniors in our country is faced with the reality of hunger. That is 5.3 million seniors who don't have enough to eat. Many are living on fixed incomes that often force them to choose between prescriptions and food—or paying their medical bills or heating their homes.

Seniors and the disabled represent about 20 percent of those who receive Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, benefits. The average SNAP benefit for households with seniors is a meager \$134 per month. Unfortunately, we also know that eligible elderly households are much less likely to participate in SNAP than other eligible households. Many seniors may not realize that they qualify for assistance, or they may simply be reluctant to ask for help.

Seniors have unique nutritional needs. Hunger is especially dangerous for seniors and can exacerbate underlying medical conditions. Food-insecure seniors are at increased risk for

conditions like depression, heart attack, diabetes, and high blood pressure.

Mr. Speaker, May is Older Americans Month, and national organizations like Feeding America, the nationwide network of food banks, are focused on raising awareness about senior hunger through their #solveseniorhunger social media campaign.

In July, we will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Older Americans Act, which provides a range of critical services, including Meals on Wheels, that enable about 11 million older adults to stay independent as long as possible. To honor that significant anniversary, I hope that Congress will pass a strong reauthorization of OAA programs, which have been flat-funded over the past decade and without a long-term authorization since 2011. Demand for OAA programs and services continues to rapidly increase as our population ages, and to think that more and more seniors will experience hunger is heartbreaking. It is unacceptable in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent the wonderful people and the work that they do at Highland Valley Elder Services throughout western Massachusetts. Every day they are making the lives of seniors a little better and a little brighter. We in Congress should do our part to ensure that our Nation's seniors don't go hungry. We should pass a strong reauthorization of the Older Americans Act and adequately fund programs like Meals on Wheels, and we should reject harmful cuts to SNAP that will disproportionately harm the most vulnerable among us: children, seniors, and the disabled.

Mr. Speaker, we should urge the White House to hold a White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Hunger to come up with a comprehensive plan to end hunger once and for all in this country. We can and we should end hunger now.

#### PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAMS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an issue that is coming upon us very quickly.

Mr. Speaker, many people across the Nation have talked about Social Security and Medicare and the trust funds going bankrupt for the retirement fund and Medicare sometime in 2033, 2034, but, Mr. Speaker, there is a more impending crisis coming down upon us. The Social Security disability trust fund is scheduled to go insolvent in 2016. That means, if we do nothing, what is going to happen in 2016 is millions of Americans across this Nation who receive those lifesaving disability benefits monthly will see a reduction in their benefits to the tune of 20 to 21 percent. That is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

Two years ago, as I serve on the Ways and Means Committee, I had an opportunity to question our Treasury Secretary, Jack Lew. I asked him the question 2 years ago: You know this crisis is on the horizon. I have read your testimony to this committee of Ways and Means, and I read the entire President's budget.

I said: Nowhere in there is a solution or a reference to this impending crisis. What is the solution the White House is offering?

Simply, what they propose is they are going to take the portion of our payroll taxes that goes to Social Security retirement that is paid by future retirees and use the \$270 billion necessary to bail out the disability trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, before I came to Congress, I had a private business. If you talk to any small-business owner across America, what they will tell you that is, it is robbing Peter to pay Paul because the Social Security retirement trust fund is on that same path to insolvency in 2033. So why would you take from one and use it to bail out another when both programs are in dire straits? So, Mr. Speaker, I said to Jack Lew this year, when I had an opportunity to question him, that is unacceptable. We need to do better not only in order to protect the Social Security retirees, who are near and dear to me, but also to those in the disability community that rely on these benefits.

The disability trust fund hasn't been reformed for decades. I care about those individuals deeply. And when I see disabled folks coming in to my office, as I have reached out to stakeholder groups and had conversations, what they tell me is they have a disability trust fund program that essentially penalizes them for trying to go back to work. That doesn't make sense.

We should be standing with the disability community if they have a capacity, a willingness, and a desire to go back to work. Our policies here in Washington, D.C., should say we are going to stand with you, we are going to encourage you, and we are going to applaud you, not penalize you, for doing that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say that this crisis needs to be dealt with. It is time to lead. What we are looking for is input from across the country on ideas on how we can reform the disability trust fund, protect our Social Security retirees to the extent that we possibly can, and make sure that we have a disability trust fund that is designed and performing in the 21st century, a trust fund that says to the disabled community, we are with you, we are going to stand next to you, and we are going to give you the resources you need in order to live a great and fruitful life. At the same time we are going to look at our Social Security retirees and say to them, "We are going to protect you."

If we can't fix this crisis coming upon us in 2016, Mr. Speaker, then how in

God's name can we fix the crises of Medicare and Social Security that are coming upon us in 2033 and thereabouts? There are millions of Americans that deserve a better answer than kicking the can down the road. Mr. Speaker, it is time to lead, and I rise today to ask all my colleagues to join me in that leadership role.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 37 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

Reverend Gregory Goethals, S.J., Loyola High School, Los Angeles, California, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come today to this holy Chamber of democracy conscious of our great gifts and conscious of the great people for whom we use these gifts in service.

Come to us. Remain with us. Enlighten our hearts. Give us courage and strength to know Your will, to make it our own, and to live it in our own lives.

Enable us to uphold the rights of others, and never let us be misled by ignorance or corrupted by fear and favor. Unite us in the bond of Your unconditional love, and keep us faithful to all that is true.

May we always temper justice with Your love so that our decisions are pleasing to You and earn for us the reward promised to all of Your good and faithful servants.

And we ask this in the name of your Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### WELCOMING REVEREND GREGORY GOETHALS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

(Mr. BECERRA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Father Gregory Goethals, a member of the Society of Jesus and the president of Loyola High School in Los Angeles, to the United States House of Representatives. We thank him for delivering today's opening prayer.

Father Goethals is one of Los Angeles' finest public servants. He has dedicated his life to educating our country's next generation of leaders. Loyola High School, an all-boys school in the Pico Union area of Los Angeles, ranks as one of the finest institutions of secondary education in America.

At Loyola, under Father Goethals, young men are motivated to become "educated" in the full sense of the word. Not only do students at Loyola go on to complete college at the finest universities in America, but they graduate Loyola having donated more than 1.5 million hours of community service to inner city schools and neighborhoods over the past 25 years.

This year, Loyola High School will celebrate its 150th anniversary, making it the oldest continually operated educational institution in southern California. Under the visionary stewardship of Father Goethals, Loyola is poised to graduate yet another era of American heroes and leaders.

For that, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me to applaud Father Gregory Goethals for his dedication to his faith and to our leaders of tomorrow. We will remember his words of prayer this morning.

#### RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) laid before the House the following resignations as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Committee on Foreign Affairs:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 18, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
Speaker of the House, The Capitol,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: With my appointment to the House Financial Services Committee, I hereby resign from the House Agriculture Committee and House Foreign Affairs Committee. It has been an honor to serve on both.

If there are any questions, please feel free to contact me. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

TOM EMMER,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 19, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign from the Committee on Homeland Security.

Sincerely,

PATRICK MEEHAN,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.  
There was no objection.

#### ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 272

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES: Mr. Emmer of Minnesota.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr. Donovan.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Mr. Donovan.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### DISTINGUISHED EAGLE SCOUT AWARD

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this evening I will have the honor and the privilege of presenting the national Eagle Scout Association's Distinguished Eagle Scout Award to Mr. John Graham, president and CEO of the American Society of Association Executives.

The Distinguished Eagle Scout Award was established in 1969 to ac-

knowledge Eagle Scouts who have received extraordinary national-level recognition or eminence within their field and have a strong record of voluntary service to the community.

Mr. Speaker, of the over 100 million Scouting alumni over the last century, less than 4 percent attain the rank of Eagle, and of these Eagles, only 1 in 1,000 will be awarded the Distinguished Eagle Scout honor. Renowned Distinguished Eagle Scouts include the president of the Boy Scouts of America, Secretary Bob Gates, Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer, President Gerald Ford, astronaut Neil Armstrong, and director Steven Spielberg.

As a fellow Distinguished Eagle Scout, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. John Graham on receiving this prestigious award.

#### SUPPORTING A LONG-TERM SOLUTION TO OUR NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE CRISIS

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, for months we have been calling for a long-term surface transportation bill to replace the one that expires at the end of this month.

In recent weeks, I have joined many of my colleagues as we counted down the days left for Congress to act. Without a funding solution, the jobs of over 600,000 American workers are at risk. The gas tax, by the way, hasn't been raised in 20 years and is no longer sufficient to pay for repairs to dangerous roads, highways, bridges, and rail lines needed to protect Americans.

We are being asked to vote this week on a bandaid approach that only runs to July instead of a real solution to this infrastructure crisis. This is often what happens here, but it is not the best way to govern. States and local transit agencies need this certainty that long-term funding will be available as they make important decisions about construction projects to meet our needs well into the future.

Let's pass a long-term transportation bill now.

#### CONGRATULATING TOYOTA MOTOR MANUFACTURING IN PRINCETON, INDIANA

(Mr. BUCSHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a manufacturer in Indiana on a tremendous milestone for not just the company, but our communities in southern Indiana. Just this month, Toyota Manufacturing in Princeton, Indiana, impressively surpassed 5,000 employees, and the plant plans to add an additional 300 positions by the end of next year.

Mr. Speaker, these are good-paying jobs that support our families and our

local economy. In addition to the workforce growth, the plant recently celebrated the production of its 4 millionth vehicle, which is a testament to the best workforce in America.

These dedicated hard-working men and women are making topnotch products in Indiana that are being shipped across the country and around the world.

#### INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the infrastructure investment can be an economic game changer. In western New York, the Federal highway bill funded the reconstruction of Fuhrman Boulevard, which reconnected our community with its waterfront, resulting in new private sector investment.

From Filmore Avenue and Ohio Street in Buffalo to Main Street in Williamsville, the Robert Moses Parkway in Niagara Falls, and Kenmore Avenue in Tonawanda, tens of millions of Federal dollars are contributing to transformative projects in our community. The construction of these projects has economic benefits as well. 660,000 jobs depend on Federal road and transit investment. Yet today, the House will extend, for just 2 months, the Federal transportation program that is weak and inadequate. We can do much better.

America needs a long-term bill that provides funding. We need to create jobs and bring our infrastructure to a state of good repair.

Last week, I introduced the Nation Building Here at Home Act to do just that. Congress should be humbled that it has allowed our infrastructure to fall into such disrepair, and we should use these 2 months to pass a long-term bill that America needs.

#### MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to observe Mental Health Awareness Month.

Approximately one in five Americans have a mental illness. That is roughly 43 million Americans. These invisible wounds are just as serious as physical ones, and it is vital we understand the health care needs of individuals living with mental illnesses.

Race, sex, age, gender—mental illnesses do not discriminate.

Many of the Americans who suffer from PTS and TBI are our veterans, our true heroes. As vice chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am familiar with their struggle. This is why I introduced the COVER Act, which recently passed in the Veterans' Affairs Health Subcommittee and which gives veterans choices to seek

alternative therapies and treatments for PTS and TBI.

As we observe Mental Health Awareness Month, let us all remember: these invisible wounds deserve our attention as much as the physical ones.

#### SAM HOUSTON HIGH SCHOOL SOCCER TEAM

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Sam Houston Texans on their soccer team and their hard-fought journey to the 6A University Interscholastic League semifinals. These 25 young men not only demonstrated their athletic talent but exemplified the teamwork and perseverance needed to complete a successful season.

I also want to congratulate Samuel Huerta, Rene Benitez, and Eddy Rodriguez of the Sam Houston High soccer team for being named to the first team 6A all-State team.

The young men of Sam Houston High School's soccer team continue a tradition of success through hard work, determination, and pride. I am proud to represent Arlington Independent School District and Sam Houston High.

To all the coaches, parents, teachers, and students of Sam Houston High School, congratulations on this incredible athletic accomplishment. You have made north Texas proud.

#### JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT

(Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in great support of S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

Today marks a significant milestone in the fight against human trafficking, and I am honored to see my amendment adopted into this legislation.

Having served as a nurse, I recognize that members of the medical community are the only outside aid to have direct contact with trafficking victims. Mr. Speaker, my amendment will educate and train health care professionals on proper techniques in order to better administer care. But, more importantly, it empowers members of the medical community so they can intervene on behalf of those being trafficked.

It has been an honor to work with my colleagues on this pivotal piece of legislation, and I am thrilled to see this legislation and my amendment move to the President's desk to be signed into law.

#### HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

(Mrs. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, there are only 2 legislative days left until the highway trust fund expires on May 31, and we do not have time to waste. Across the country, 6,000 critical construction jobs are in jeopardy, and 660,000 good-paying construction jobs are hanging in the balance.

In Michigan, we know how desperately this funding is needed. Seventeen percent of our roads are rated in good shape—only 17 percent; 38 percent of our roads are in poor, some dangerous—not fair, but poor, condition. It is unacceptable.

We must work together to find a long-term solution to repair our roads, bridges, and transit. Today our Republican colleagues have introduced a plan that just kicks it down the road again. This must be the last time. Funding the highway trust fund is about this Nation's future. It is about our competitiveness. It is about providing businesses and local and State governments the certainty that they need, and it is about good-paying jobs for working families.

It is time to end this culture of crisis and bring to the floor a long-term, sustainable solution to authorize the highway trust fund.

□ 1215

#### HOPEFULLY THE PRESIDENT CHANGES COURSE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the President's decision to target Abu Sayyaf where Special Operations Forces heroically carried out a successful mission. I hope this is a change of course where the President takes action to stop further attacks on American families for a strategy of victory.

Sadly, the same day, ISIL murderers seized the Anbar capital of Ramadi, holding one-third of Iraq, revealing the President's failure to negotiate a Status of Forces Agreement. This follows the mass murder of Muslim pilgrims in Karachi, Pakistan, and Egyptian Christians in Libya. Radical Islamic attacks are increasing worldwide with the murder of Jews in Paris, the killing of troops at Fort Hood, and the stabbing in London.

Incredibly, the President continues negotiations with the murderous ideology of Tehran while they continue development of intercontinental ballistic missiles to fulfill their goal of death to America, death to Israel. Hopefully, the President will divert policies to establish a legacy of peace through strength. The President can avoid a legacy of continued attacks by terrorists who have declared war on the American people.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

#### COMMEMORATING THE HONORABLE SERVICE OF WARREN JACKSON AND ROY DUMONT

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the honorable service of Mr. Warren Jackson and Mr. Roy Dumont, both who bravely fought in the United States Army in World War II. Both gentlemen, who are from my hometown of Flint, Michigan, are in Washington today to visit the World War II Memorial and to pay their respects to their fellow men and women in uniform who paid the ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. Jackson served honorably in the 3758th Quartermaster Truck Company throughout World War II and retired from the 41st Artillery in 1966. Mr. Dumont served honorably in the 87th Infantry Division, the Golden Acorns, from 1942 through 1945. These men risked their lives to defend freedoms that we cherish and often take for granted as Americans, and our country is and should be forever grateful to them for their service.

Mr. Jackson and Mr. Dumont, on behalf of the people of the Fifth Congressional District and on behalf of the entire 114th Congress, I thank you for wearing the uniform of the United States and defending this great Nation. You will forever have our lasting gratitude.

#### FREE ENTERPRISE AND OPEN MARKETS: KEYS TO A HEALTHY AND GROWING ECONOMY

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, policies that support free enterprise and open markets are the key to building a strong economy. Texas is a prime example.

For the 11th year in a row, Texas has been ranked by Chief Executive magazine as the number one State to relocate your business to; and for more than 20 years straight, Texas job creation has outpaced the rest of the country by a factor of 2 to 1.

Behind this lasting success are policies that have enhanced economic agreement and allowed Texas-made goods to be sold at markets across the world. It is no surprise Texas has also led the Nation in exports for the last 13 years running.

Allowing free enterprise and open markets to thrive has fueled decades of Texas growth. It has also created millions of good-paying jobs for Texas families. Let's build on these successful free market policies and bring lasting strength to our American economy.

#### TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House



for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, from city halls to the Halls of Congress, there is universal agreement that our national infrastructure, once the envy of the world, is eroding around us. It is eroding from simple political inattention and inaction.

We must stop short-term fixes for our long-term infrastructure. We must develop a sustainable funding solution to repair, to restore, and to upgrade our infrastructure.

The remaining question is: How do we solve it here and now? Are we going to do a responsible, long-term funding solution or are we just going to kick the can down the road? Are we going to wait for more bridges to collapse, for trains to derail, and more roads to fall into gridlock?

Mr. Speaker, we must come together to solve this problem. The safety of every American, the efficiency of every business, and the momentum of our national economy depend on us and are at risk.

#### HONORING FIRE CHIEF BILL MUND OF THE CITY OF ST. CLOUD, MINNESOTA

(Mr. EMMER of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Chief Bill Mund, who retires this week after more than a decade as fire chief of the City of St. Cloud, Minnesota.

Chief Mund is a St. Cloud boy through and through. He not only grew up in the Granite City, but after graduating from Apollo High School in 1977 and serving in the United States Navy, he returned to his hometown. He has dedicated his career to his hometown community, joining the St. Cloud Fire Department 32 years ago.

Before becoming St. Cloud's fire chief, he was the assistant chief to his predecessor, Mike Holman. Now as chief, he has overseen five fire stations and 63 firefighters that respond to approximately 4,000 incidents each year.

Thank you for all you have done for the St. Cloud community, Chief Mund. Enjoy your retirement. You deserve it.

#### HONORING AND REMEMBERING SIX HEROIC UNITED STATES MARINES

(Mr. ASHFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember six heroic United States marines who died last week serving our country during a humanitarian lifesaving mission halfway around the world. They were killed in a tragic helicopter crash in Nepal as they delivered badly needed supplies to that nation's suffering earthquake victims.

Among the six are two men with close ties to Nebraska. One of the heli-

copter's decorated pilots, 29-year-old Captain Dustin Lukaszewicz, grew up in Wilcox, Nebraska. Prior to serving in Nepal, he was deployed in Afghanistan. Captain Lukaszewicz leaves behind his wife, Ashley, and one daughter. Ashley is also pregnant and due to deliver next month.

Twenty-two-year-old Lance Corporal Jacob Hug, a decorated combat videographer from Arizona, leaves behind several family members and close friends who live in Omaha and neighboring Council Bluffs, Iowa. Corporal Hug was capturing images of the Marine Corps' relief efforts in Nepal. Prior to deploying to Nepal, Corporal Hug filmed and photographed marines from South Korea, Thailand, Australia, Japan, Guam, and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in keeping these brave, selfless individuals and their families in your thoughts and prayers.

#### PAYING TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL R. MARTIN UMBARGER OF THE INDIANA NATIONAL GUARD

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Hoosier, a true patriot, and my friend, Major General R. Martin Umbarger of the Indiana National Guard. He is retiring at the end of this month.

General Umbarger started his career in public service as an enlisted soldier in the Indiana Army National Guard in 1969. Over the next three decades, Marty rose through the ranks and stood out as a remarkable leader. In 2004, then-Governor Mitch Daniels appointed him Adjutant General of the State of Indiana, where he served as the highest ranking military officer in our great State's National Guard for more than 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, General Umbarger is a true Hoosier hero. His shoes will be big ones to fill.

Best of luck in your retirement, sir, and thank you for your incredible service to our State and our Nation.

#### DEFERRED ACTION FOR PARENTAL ACCOUNTABILITY APPLICATIONS

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, today the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement was supposed to begin accepting Deferred Action for Parental Accountability, or DAPA, applications. It was to be a day of hope, not disappointment, for millions of families across the country. But because of a politically motivated decision by a Texas judge, implementation has been halted. Now 17,000 hard-working men and women in Clark County, Nevada, must wait for relief in fear of being torn from their families.

Mr. Speaker, Nevada is the State with the largest share of undocumented immigrants in its total population—210,000 people, or 7.6 percent, and that is equal to 10.2 percent of our workforce. They are our colleagues, our neighbors, our classmates, and our friends, and they play a vital role in the success of our community.

Congress needs to pass comprehensive immigration reform so families across the country and in Nevada can come out of the shadows, legally work, go to school, and contribute to the only community they call home.

#### THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

(Mr. WESTERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I realize, like my friends across the aisle, that we find ourselves in a crisis situation of our own making. The Federal highway trust fund is set to run out of money, and with our current infrastructure needs, the fund's moneys are simply not enough. But instead of addressing the issue during the last several Congresses, short-term fixes have been passed, and Congress has kicked the can down the road. We need more than rhetoric on the importance of infrastructure. We need solutions.

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday I will introduce the Prioritizing American Roads and Jobs Act. This bill will roll back 100 percent Medicaid expansion reimbursement rates to be equal to traditional Medicaid rates, with the savings transferring to the highway trust fund. This bill will add \$15 billion a year to the trust fund and put it back on the path to financial stability for the long term, while freeing up \$150 billion for deficit reduction over the next 10 years.

#### EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of continuing investments in early childhood education.

Yesterday marked the 50th anniversary launch of Head Start. Head Start programs give students an opportunity to start out strong and help to close the achievement gap that plagues many low-income communities.

As a mother, grandmother, and retired educator, I recognize that early education provides students with the resources they need in the most critical learning years. More than 27 percent of the people in my district live below the poverty line. Students in low-income families have obvious disadvantages that are exacerbated when they arrive in kindergarten less prepared than their peers.

More than 3,000 children in my district benefit from Head Start programs. These programs give many children the jump-start and the confidence



they need. Research shows that children enrolled in high-quality education programs are more likely to graduate from high school, go to college, and secure high-paying jobs.

Mr. Speaker, an investment in early education is an investment in our future. I will continue fighting for early learning initiatives and commonsense education reform that prepare all of our students to succeed, and I call on my colleagues to do the same.

#### COMMENDING CADET JONATHAN CHASE STRICKLAND

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend Cadet Jonathan Chase Strickland of the University of North Georgia Corps of Cadets for being selected as the top ROTC cadet in the Nation. Cadet Strickland was also selected as the United States Army Cadet Command's Cadet of the Year for 2015.

Mr. Speaker, Chase was selected out of 5,617 Army ROTC cadets across the Nation based on outstanding performance in physical fitness, campus leadership, and academic record. A factor in his selection was his successful completion of the Army's Leadership Development and Assessment Course.

Chase is a native of Gainesville, Georgia, attended North Hall High School, and will graduate this spring from my alma mater, the University of North Georgia, with a degree in international affairs. He will be commissioned into the Army as a 2nd lieutenant in military intelligence. He plans on attending the Infantry Officer Leadership School at Fort Benning and the Ranger School.

After watching Chase grow up, knowing his father and his grandfather and his fine family, it is not surprising that he rose to the top. Please join me in congratulating Cadet Strickland on this truly great accomplishment, and wish him the very best and a successful career of service to our country.

□ 1230

#### CONGRESS MUST ADDRESS OUR BROKEN IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, today should have been a great day of celebration of hope and relief for the millions of hard-working immigrant families across the country who would be able to register for the expanded DACA and DAPA programs.

DACA's expansion and the new DAPA program would provide welcome relief to thousands of hard-working immigrant families, allowing them to pay a fine, register, get right with the law,

and work legally. Unfortunately, they sit in limbo while they wait for a judge to decide the fate of the DACA and DAPA programs.

It should be incumbent on any politician who seeks to thwart or undermine these programs to propose a legislative solution through Congress. That is everybody's first choice. Only Congress can provide a pathway to citizenship. Only Congress can permanently replace our broken immigration system with one that works, one that restores the rule of law, one that secures our border, and one that provides a pathway to citizenship.

I hope the fifth circuit will rule on the side of justice and the rule of law by lifting the injunction; but no matter what happens, this judicial mess is just further proof of Congress' failure to act.

I call upon Congress to address our broken immigration system and move forward with restoring the rule of law.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 19, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 19, 2015 at 9:30 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 43.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. REEVES,  
*Deputy Clerk.*

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 19, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 19, 2015 at 11:27 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2252.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. REEVES,  
*Deputy Clerk.*

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1806, AMERICA COMPETES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2250, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2353, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2015

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 271 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 271

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1806) to provide for technological innovation through the prioritization of Federal investment in basic research, fundamental scientific discovery, and development to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-15. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2250) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the

fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2353) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, H. Res. 271, providing for consideration of three important bills.

This rule provides for consideration of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015 and the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 2016

under structured rules, and the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015 under a closed rule. It is important to note that this combined rule allows for separate consideration of each bill. This House will separately debate and consider these important issues.

The Legislative Branch Appropriations bill is traditionally considered under a structured amendment process, and that practice is continued today.

The America COMPETES Act makes a dozen amendments in order, with more than half—eight amendments—coming from Democratic sponsors.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1806 is a fiscally responsible proscience bill that reauthorizes civilian research programs at the Department of Energy, the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy.

The bill keeps our Nation competitive on the global stage and works to refocus the Federal Government's primary scientific role to fund basic research. This reprioritization of basic research will help ensure future U.S. economic competitiveness and security and will spur additional private sector technological innovation, which is crucial to the United States remaining a world leader in scientific and technological advances.

This bill keeps overall funding for these programs equal to the fiscal year 2015 appropriated levels and is consistent with the caps set by the Budget Control Act, prioritizing taxpayer investment in basic research without increasing overall Federal spending.

The emphasis this legislation places on Federal investment and research in the physical sciences and engineering helps to develop and advance knowledge and technologies used in fields by scientists who are dedicated to improving the lives of all Americans.

I have seen firsthand the importance of these investments while visiting the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, one of our 17 national labs, which I am proud to represent in my district, Washington's Fourth District.

The work being done at PNNL and at the national labs and research universities all across the country is critical to our country's future, and the prioritizations and reforms on this bill will enhance the work being done to the benefit of all Americans.

Additionally, H.R. 1806 reduces by \$1 billion the administration's large and unjustified program, such as late stage commercialization, which picks winners and losers that compete with the private sector.

We must be responsible stewards of taxpayer dollars, and this legislation will prevent duplicative and wasteful research activities by requiring the Department of Energy to certify that the work being done is original and has not already been conducted by another Federal agency.

Overall, the America COMPETES Act will reestablish the priority of basic re-

search in the core physical sciences and biology in the Nation's civilian science agencies. This bill sets the right priorities for our Nation's civilian research and will promote U.S. innovation, ingenuity, and competitiveness, all without increasing our national debt or deficit.

This rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 2250, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 2016. This legislation provides funding for all operations of the United States House of Representatives, the U.S. Capitol complex, the Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, and the many other agencies that are so important to the day-to-day functions of Congress.

H.R. 2250 provides the legislative branch with \$3.3 billion in fiscal year 2016—the same amount as fiscal year 2014, as well as fiscal year 2015—continuing this Chamber's commitment to leading by example during these times of huge deficits and out-of-control debt.

The activities this bill funds are critical to the operations of the Capitol complex, which must be protected, cared for, and maintained. Visitors from my district in central Washington, as well as visitors from across the country and throughout the world, travel countless miles to visit this remarkable institution, which is a symbol of democracy and freedom for so many.

For these and many other reasons, we must ensure that the Capitol remains in this pristine condition and is able to withstand the test of time so that many future generations are able to visit this truly unique and historic place.

□ 1245

Finally, this rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015.

H.R. 2353 will extend the highway trust fund's expenditure authority for 2 months—from May 31 to July 31. It will also provide an extension for many important Federal highway and public transportation programs, such as the motor carrier and highway safety programs as well as the hazardous materials transportation program, through July 31.

Last August, Congress passed and the President signed the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014, which was intended to provide enough funding for the highway trust fund to remain solvent through May 31 of this year. However, the funding is now lasting longer than was originally predicted, and this bill will extend the trust fund's expenditure authority so that transportation spending is able to continue through July while Congress works to find a solution that will ensure the trust fund remains solvent for years to come. A constructive dialogue in Congress is needed on this issue, one that will give States the certainty they need to build the roads, the bridges,

and other infrastructure that our communities and our economy need to thrive in the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, straightforward rule. I support its adoption, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills.

We should be celebrating today the start of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals expansion and the Deferred Action for Parents of American Citizens program that President Obama launched in light of the continued failure of this Congress to finally fix our broken immigration system. This Congress hasn't brought forth a single immigration bill, not secured our border, not ensured that employers follow our law and only employ legal American workers; but, rather, at every opportunity, it has sought to thwart the executive branch, doing what they can with the powers they have under our U.S. Constitution to restore the rule of law without the help of this body.

These three bills before us today are yet another way of kicking the ball down the road and refusing to address our broken immigration system, a problem that will continue to get worse until Congress steps up and solves it.

I hope that the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program's expansion, known as DACA—already a great success with additional success along the way with the new expansion—and the Deferred Action for Parents of American Citizens program, or DAPA, are soon unclogged by the courts to at least reduce the size of this sometimes insurmountable problem that Congress continues to refuse to tackle. That is the alternative.

If Congress continues to bring up three bills every week and if none of them are about border security and none of them are about immigration, do you know what? Instead of there being 10 million people here illegally, there are going to be 15 or 20 million here 10 years. That is exactly where this Republican Congress is leading us—towards an America where, someday, there might be more people here illegally than there are here legally. Think about that, Mr. Speaker.

This first bill that we are considering before us today is not immigration reform. It is, instead, a 2-month extension of the current surface transportation authorization. Our transportation system is the lifeblood of our country. It dictates our ability to move and manage not only people but information, ideas, products, industries, commerce, jobs. By failing to pass a long-term transportation reauthorization, which will ensure the security of

our highways and transit systems for more than 60 days, we are putting our Nation's economic lifeblood in jeopardy.

The second bill we will see before us today is not immigration reform. The second bill, instead, is a partisan attempt to inject the ideological priorities of my Republican colleagues into education and research, priorities that are opposed by the very titans of research for whom this bill is ostensibly designed. I will talk more about that in a moment.

Of the third bill before us today, I am hopeful. Is it immigration reform? I ask the gentleman from Washington: Is the third bill before us today immigration reform? I am happy to yield to the gentleman for an answer.

In reclaiming my time, he is speechless. He is speechless because he knows the truth: the third bill is not immigration reform. The third bill is actually the funding bill for the legislative branch of government. Maybe if the legislative branch of government were actually doing its job we would have an immigration reform bill before us; but, no, my colleague from Washington is speechless because he knows as well as I do that this is not immigration reform, that it is, instead, a funding bill for Members of Congress' salaries and the salaries of our staffs. I guess that is more important than securing our border. I guess that is more important to the Republicans than restoring the rule of law.

Let me get into these three bills.

The Surface Transportation Act would extend the authority of the government to fund our highways for 2 months—only for 2 months. What that means is we risk wasting \$51 billion and, in jeopardizing that funding, risk over 660,000 jobs by failing to do a long-term authorization of the highway trust fund.

We all have an interest in this. Any one of us can talk about the importance of transportation in our districts. If you have ever been to Colorado, you will know that there is one major artery to get to our world-class ski facilities and unparalleled 14,000 peaks from the metro area—Highway 70. If you have ever taken it, particularly on a Friday, or have come back on a Sunday, you might very well have sat in your car at a dead stop. If you have been to Fort Collins, which is the largest city in my district and is home to one of our great universities, Colorado State University, you might have found similar circumstances around the long rush hour on Highway 25 north. Waiting 45 minutes in traffic to go 5 or 10 miles is something my constituents do every day—doubling, tripling, quadrupling their commuting time.

These stories aren't unique to Colorado. They aren't unique to my district. I will bet every Member of Congress can share the importance of transportation in their districts. That is why, ostensibly, every Member of

Congress says, "We want transportation. We support roads."

There are no Republican roads and Democratic roads. There are roads. Yet, by continuing to fail to provide a long-term funding structure for them, we are playing games with the livelihoods of the American people, hurting our own economic lifeblood, wasting people's time as they are sitting in traffic, throwing into jeopardy the status of the jobs of contractors and subcontractors, and risking lives by continuing to repair our necessary bridges and infrastructure that have accumulated safety deficits. I urge my colleagues to consider the irresponsibility inherent in this punt.

I would also like to talk about the America COMPETES Act. Now, the original genesis of this bill, which was passed in 2007, was to help America compete in an increasingly global environment across the sciences and to ensure our innovative spirit.

My district is a hub for scientific research, and we are excited to have the University of Colorado at Boulder, Colorado State University, NOAA, NREL, and NCAR. Research that is done in Colorado has ramifications and positive effects across the country, like our space weather lab in Boulder, which helps make sure that air traffic controllers and pilots have access to up-to-the-minute information about solar flares that could alter their trajectories in realtime.

This bill, instead of continuing the bipartisan legacy that the original COMPETES Act sets out or instead of replacing our broken immigration system with one that works for our country, seems to cherry-pick winners based on ideology and overturns the historic priorities of the bill. Why else would the dean of Research at CU-Boulder oppose this bill? Why else would our widely respected Secretary of Energy oppose this bill? Dozens of the largest scientific organizations and coalitions—this is supposed to be a science bill—are saying, "Don't give us this bill. It will hurt science in our country." How does that even make any sense?

The efforts of the Republicans to hijack this legislation for ideological interests are utterly transparent. Scientists are saying, "Go home Federal Government. Don't help us with this bill." Again, in yet another instance of Federal overreach, the Republicans are imposing their versions of science on those in the field who are doing work.

Finally, this rule brings forth H.R. 2250, also a bill that is not immigration reform. It does nothing to secure our border, but it does make sure that Members of Congress get paid. I am sure Republicans can go home happy about that. It makes sure our hard-working staff gets paid, the committees get paid, and the buildings get repaired.

No, I am not against those things. Those are fine things. If we had an all-volunteer legislature, we probably

wouldn't have the fine caliber of statesmen we have tackling our national problems here today. But it is not immigration reform, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't secure our border, and it will only continue to increase the number of people who are here illegally in our country while Congress continues to punt and to undermine the efforts of the President to do what he can with the powers he has through DACA and DAPA, which were scheduled to start today.

I do want to point out that the underlying draft of this Legislative Branch Appropriations Act is another example of the failure to address many of the needs of our country. There was an effort by my colleague DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ to put forward an amendment to ensure that House cafeteria workers receive a living wage. You would think we would want to be an example of a model employer. I would hope that we, as custodians of the U.S. Capitol, would take some pride in that we are a model employer; we are a little microcosm of what employers should do, best practices. But there is a Senate employee who is homeless because, on the salary he gets, he can't even afford to rent here in Washington. People who work every day here in the Nation's Capital are living in poverty.

I think that we can do better as a model employer. If this were my company, I would take no pride in that. I would like to think that this is our company. It is the United States of America, and we are the board. Let's have employment policies that we as employers can be proud of.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and to, instead, bring to the floor immigration reform or better versions of these bills: a science bill that, maybe, scientists support, maybe; or a transportation bill that maybe funds our highways for more than 2 months so that people can plan. It is time we begin working for the American people, not against them.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I share the gentleman from Colorado's opinion that the issue of immigration reform is huge, that it is one of the biggest issues facing this country today. I agree that we need to give it adequate debate and time and consideration; although, today is not the day.

Mr. Speaker, we recently heard from colleagues on the other side of the aisle that combining multiple bills in a single rule can lead to fragmented and confusing debate.

In an effort to refocus our debate today, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the distinguished chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me time, and who is a former member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee himself.

H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, is a pro-science, fiscally responsible bill that sets America on a path to remain the world's leader in innovation. This bill reauthorizes civilian research programs at the National Science Foundation, at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, at the Department of Energy, and at the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

Since January, the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee has held numerous hearings that have provided input into this bill. This includes budget hearings with the NSF Director, the Acting NIST Director, the Secretary of Energy, and the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. But our consideration of the provisions in this bill began long before last year.

In the last Congress, the Science, Space, and Technology Committee held numerous hearings on the topics addressed by this bill as well, and many of the provisions in the bill were debated during the Science, Space, and Technology Committee's consideration of the first act last Congress, which the Science, Space, and Technology Committee passed in May.

Title I of the bill reauthorizes the National Science Foundation for 2 years and provides a 4.3 percent increase for research and related activities. The bill prioritizes funding for the directors of biology, computer science, engineering, and mathematics and physical sciences, and it recognizes the need to make strategic investments in basic R&D for the U.S. to remain the global leader in science and innovation.

The bill reprioritizes research spending at the National Science Foundation by reducing funding for the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Directorate and Geosciences. The bill, instead, focuses funds on the physical sciences from which there are almost all of the scientific breakthroughs that drive new technology, new businesses, industries, and job creation and that spurs innovation.

Tight Federal budget constraints require all taxpayers' dollars to be spent on high-value science in the national interest. Unfortunately, the National Science Foundation has funded a number of projects that do not meet the highest standards of scientific merit—from climate change musicals, to evaluating animal photographs in National Geographic, to studying human-set fires in New Zealand in the 1800s—and there are dozens of other examples.

□ 1300

The bill ensures accountability by restoring the original intent of the 1950 NSF Act and requiring that all grants serve the national interest.

Title II represents the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's commitment to enhancing STEM education programs. A healthy and viable STEM workforce is critical to American in-

dustries and ensures our future economic prosperity. The definition of STEM is expanded to include computer science, which connects all STEM subjects.

Title III includes three bipartisan bills the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology approved in March. Those bills—H.R. 1119, the Research and Development Efficiency Act; H.R. 1156, the International Science and Technology Cooperation Act of 2015; and H.R. 1162, the Science Prize Competitions Act—passed the committee by voice vote. Two of these bills were sponsored by Democrats.

Title IV supports the important measurement standards and technology work taking place at the National Institute for Standards and Technology laboratories, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, and the recently authorized Network for Manufacturing Innovation.

Title V reauthorizes the Department of Energy Office of Science for 2 years at a 5.4 percent increase over fiscal year 2015. It prioritizes basic research that enables researchers in all 50 States to have access to world-class user facilities, including supercomputers and high-intensity light sources. This bill also prevents duplication and requires DOE to certify that its climate science work is unique and not being undertaken by other Federal agencies.

Title VI reauthorizes the DOE applied research and development programs and activities for fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017.

H.R. 1806 refocuses some spending on late-stage commercialization efforts within the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy to research and development efforts.

Title VII proposes to cut red tape and bureaucracy in the DOE technology transfer process. Currently, the private sector has little incentive to build reactor prototypes due to regulatory uncertainty from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

H.R. 1806 sets the right priorities for Federal civilian research, which enhances innovation and U.S. competitiveness without adding to the Federal deficit and debt. I encourage all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I was told the gentleman from Washington shares a desire to address the broken immigration system. I know the chair of the Committee on Rules, Mr. SESSIONS, has indicated similarly. Just as I have posed to Mr. SESSIONS in the past, I would like to pose to the gentleman from Washington if he has a timeframe for when we can expect immigration legislation here on the floor of the House.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington to answer that.

Well, sometimes silence speaks louder than words.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a

member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to just one aspect on the floor of this rule. My colleague from Washington made a statement that we are dealing with a 2-month extension because we found some extra money to let it last longer.

No, the reason that we are having a 2-month extension is because we have not been able to resolve this problem. I made the remarks on the floor of the House last summer that extending it to May is not going to get us anyplace, and we would be right back in the same spot. I could dust off the same speech.

What is happening is that you have a little tiny bit of give, but it doesn't mean that we have enough money and that there aren't consequences. There are States across the country, because of the uncertainty of the Republican funding approach, that are already cutting back on construction projects this summer.

This will be the 33rd short-term funding extension. It is a symbol of the failure of my Republican colleagues to do anything in the 55 months that they have been in charge to deal with transportation funding. They have never even had a hearing on transportation finance.

Now, I will say that over the last 22 years there have been some bipartisan failures to step up to it. Ironically, the solution is clear, thoroughly studied, and broadly supported: raise the gas tax for the first time since 1993.

The Republican leadership doesn't have to do anything extraordinary, just allow the Committee on Ways and Means to follow regular order. Have some serious committee hearings. Listen to the experts. Invite in the stakeholders that build, that maintain, and use our transportation system. Let's have at the witness dais heads of the AFL-CIO, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—who agree we should raise the gas tax—the head of transit, the American Trucking Association, AAA, bicyclists.

They could refer back to great Republican leaders of the past. Dwight Eisenhower established the gas tax to fund the Interstate Highway System. Ronald Reagan, the conservative icon, called Congress back in November of 1982 to more than double the gas tax, which Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill did.

In fact, my Republican friends could involve Republican leaders today. Six Republican States have raised the gas tax already this year: Idaho, Iowa, Nebraska, Utah, South Dakota, Georgia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Not exactly liberal bastions.

This is something that we can and should do. Let's step up, solve this

problem, avoid this continual uncertainty for people around the country. They deserve better.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, just a note to my colleague from Colorado, I agree that this is an important issue that he keeps bringing up of immigration, and I will certainly ask my chairman for any timeframe, and I will look forward to working with him and all my colleagues on solving this important issue.

But today we are talking about highways. We are talking about science. We are talking about keeping this place running smoothly.

To get us back on subject, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me the time. I am glad to hear I am getting us back on subject.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule on H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015. This is fiscally responsible legislation that cuts wasteful government spending and prioritizes innovative scientific research and development.

A key reform included in the America COMPETES Act is reining in spending at the Department of Energy's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, or EERE. EERE's budget has grown by almost 60 percent in the last decade. President Obama's fiscal year 2016 budget request for EERE is over \$2.7 billion, with a B, which is a requested increase of another \$800 million over last fiscal year.

The Department of Energy's approach to energy research and development has also become more and more unbalanced with the EERE's continued growth. In fact, the President's proposed budget for EERE R&D is more than double the budgets for nuclear, fossil, and electricity R&D combined. In addition, the work prioritized by EERE is far too focused on increasing the use of today's existing technology. Many EERE programs are focused on reducing market barriers for existing technology or funding R&D activities already prioritized by the private sector, not conducting the fundamental research to build towards future breakthroughs.

With our national debt at \$18 trillion and rising, and spending caps guiding budgets on everything from energy to national defense, Congress cannot rubberstamp this kind of out-of-control spending. It is time to adjust the Department of Energy's budget to reality.

The America COMPETES Act refocuses Federal investment on energy research and development, not deployment of today's technology. By funding the basic research and development prioritized in the America COMPETES Act, the Department of Energy can build a foundation for the private sector to bring innovative energy technology to the market and thereby grow the American economy.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this rule and "yes" on H.R.

1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS), the ranking member on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology Subcommittee on Space.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today both as a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I can't think of a worse rule, frankly, that we could bring to the floor. We could have had bipartisan cooperation on America COMPETES so that we can invest in our science and our research and our technology, and yet that is not what is happening here today.

As to the Highway and Transportation Funding Act, it doesn't allow for any amendments to the legislation that would fix and fund our Nation's crumbling infrastructure with predictability, stability, and for the long term. The highway trust fund and the current surface transportation authorization, as we know, are set to expire on May 31, leaving just 3 legislative days to extend it or 4,000 transportation workers will be laid off and work would stop on Federal highway programs all across the country right in the middle of prime construction and building season.

Now, the responsible among us know that we can't walk away from the highway trust fund. Millions of jobs and thousands of businesses hang in the balance. But we also know that what is before us today is the least most responsible way to fund our infrastructure—2 months at a time. Can you believe it? Two months at a time, Mr. Speaker; no long-term projects, no opportunity for planning, no relief for workers, and at another pivotal moment in the construction season.

As a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, today I am joining Ranking Member DEFAZIO and ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON in introducing the GROW AMERICA Act on behalf of the administration. This bill would serve us well to provide \$478 billion over 6 years for our highways, bridges, transit, rail, and highway safety programs. This long-term and robust funding bill is a 45 percent increase over our current spending on our tatterdemalion and crumbling infrastructure. It is the type of plan that we have to ensure that our major-league economy does not have the infrastructure that wouldn't even fit children playing T-ball.

While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle twiddle their thumbs 2 months at a time, America is falling apart. Once one of the leaders in the world in quality infrastructure, we are now number 16, according to the World Economic Forum. According to the American Society of Engineers, the overall assessment of our Nation's infrastructure ranks with a whopping D-plus.

Now look at my home State of Maryland: 5,305 bridges are deficient; they are falling apart. That is 27 percent of the bridges in our State. Just a few months ago, one of my constituents was driving along Suitland Parkway, minding her own business, when a chunk of cement fell and hit her car hood because the bridge was in disrepair.

Though it is not my preference, we have to extend the highway trust fund today, and I challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to use this time to go through a bipartisan negotiation on how to pay for our long-term and fully funded investments to construct and rebuild our roads, bridges, transit, and rail infrastructure.

Thirty-four extensions of the highway trust fund, 52 votes against ACA. Come on, let's get serious. Move away from the kids' table; get to the grown-up table and fund our highway transportation and infrastructure.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the reason you hear so many people talking about different topics is there are three completely unrelated topics in this single rule. There is the funding for all of the legislative salaries and the people who work in this building, that is one bill; another one funds roads, but only for 2 months, across the whole country; and the other one is the one that they say is for science but all the scientists oppose. So that is why it is so confusing. There are three completely unrelated bills in here, none of which do a thing about illegal immigration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

□ 1315

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we need a surface transportation bill, but the last thing in the world we need is this bill, a 2-month extension.

If this short-term plan was a necessary step to get us to a long-term bill, that would make some sense; but, as speakers have noted, this is the 33rd time in the past 5 years where Congress has failed to provide long-term and sustainable funding for our surface transportation needs. This is a habit; it is not a plan.

Mr. Speaker, this bill follows on the heels of the bill we passed 9 months ago, and that was a 9-month extension of surface transportation paid for by "pension smoothing." You can't make that up.

We lowered the obligation corporations pay to pensions in order to put money in the highway transportation fund. We created a pothole in pensions to fix potholes in the highways; it makes no sense, but now, we are here on a 2-month plan—a good job, Congress.

We were given some assurances that we would have a long-term bill. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there are good long-term plans out there. Congressman RENACCI has a plan, the President has a plan, as do Congressman DELANEY and Congressman BLUMENAUER. There are policies out there. We don't need a policy debate. We need a decision.

The reality is we have got to make Congress work, do its job, and pass a long-term funding bill that is going to allow this country to modernize its airports, fix its bridges, make its railroads safer, and dredge our ports deeper.

We have to bring our 20th century infrastructure into the 21st century, and the only way we are going to get that done is by stepping up to the responsibility that we have to pass a long-term funding plan.

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to the Speaker himself that it is a tough job putting a bill on the floor. It always is tough when Congress has to pull the trigger on what that revenue source is going to be.

I will support any plan that is reasonable and sustainable. The only plan I won't support is no revenue plan at all.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the good gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, prior to coming to Congress, I worked at the Economic Development Board for Tacoma, and in my office, I had a sign that said: "We are competing with everyone, everywhere, every day, forever."

That sentiment was echoed in a report by the National Academies last decade called, "Rising Above the Gathering Storm," which was the main influence behind the bipartisan America COMPETES Act. The report provided us with a pathway on how to increase American competitiveness so that we don't fall behind our global competitors.

Its finding were stark. The report told us that, if we are going to compete as a nation, if we want innovation to happen here in America, if we want jobs to be created here in America, we need to make significant investments in basic research and double the funding dedicated toward research and development. That is from that report.

That is not what we are doing here today. In fact, funding for basic research in the bill that we are currently debating fails to keep up with the rate of inflation. It fails to live up to the standards set forth in that bipartisan report.

When this bill was first considered in the Science, Space, and Technology Committee last Congress, a group of my fellow members of the New Demo-

cratic Coalition developed a set of principles we thought should guide a reauthorization of America COMPETES legislation.

These principles included increasing funding for basic research, stabilizing funding for research and development, and supporting policies that spark innovation.

We were disappointed when the FIRST Act strayed away from these policies and are disappointed this America COMPETES legislation fails to make investments needed for America to remain competitive in the 21st century.

The amendment I introduced, along with my colleagues, does not call for doubling the funding for research and development in the underlying bill or put funding on pace with what was outlined in "Rising Above the Gathering Storm." The amendment we put forward was a compromise. Unfortunately, this amendment was made out of order and not brought to the floor for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, if we fail to make critical investments in research and innovation, America will fall behind. Let's take up a bill that lives up to the spirit of bipartisanship and the goals laid out in "Rising Above the Gathering Storm." Let's compete everywhere, every day, forever.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS), who represents one of the strongest science clusters in the United States in San Diego.

Mr. PETERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our country, as Mr. KILMER pointed out, is facing an ever-increasing global competition for scientific research. We can't afford to cede the leading edge we have built up in innovation to other countries, but the current level of funding in the underlying COMPETES bill does not provide adequate and constant funding for our basic scientific endeavors.

It cuts energy efficiency and renewable energy by 37 percent, cuts electric grid reliability research by 30 percent, and cuts the Advanced Research Projects Agency for Energy, or ARPA-E, by 50 percent.

These levels will not maintain strong foundations for basic scientific research and will make it even harder for us to retain young scientists in the United States. The Scripps Institution of Oceanography, a world leader in ocean research, has noted the harmful cuts to the geoscientist program, which is used to improve prediction for events, including earthquakes, tornados, hurricanes, tsunamis, drought, and solar storms. At a time of increasingly extreme weather, we should be investing in research, not cutting it.

Unfortunately, the amendment offered by Mr. KILMER, Ms. ESTY, and me to increase funding by a small but significant 3.5 percent was not even given



a chance to have a vote here on the House floor.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this rule and to stand up for America's scientists and our competitiveness.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I want to thank the gentleman from the great State of Colorado for yielding and for his leadership on the Rules Committee and on so many other important issues before this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the highway trust fund, which finances highway and transportation projects all across this country, is set to expire at the end of this month. It is coming right up. Passing a short-term fix is necessary because the Republicans have ignored our Nation's transportation needs for the past 10 months, since the last short-term extension was passed.

We don't need a short-term extension. We need long-term planning and investment in our infrastructure. The sad reality is that the United States is not investing nearly enough in its infrastructure. As a share of gross domestic product, we invest about one-half of what Europe does. We invest only one-quarter of what China does.

As you look at this chart, it shows the amount of road traffic volume is up 297 percent; yet the public spending on road maintenance is so much lower, 125 percent. It is nearly 2.5 times faster that we are spending—and having volume go up—but we are not investing in our infrastructure to keep up with this volume.

One out of every four bridges is structurally deficient or functionally obsolete in the United States. We have had two bridges with cars on them that literally collapsed in recent history.

The question of whether to fix our infrastructure is not about the money. We are already spending the money, fixing our cars when they hit yet another pothole or wasting our time sitting in traffic. Why don't we have high-speed rail like the rest of the world?

Let's save ourselves some time and money by investing wisely to support our transportation infrastructure through the highway trust fund.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, this rule under this debate covers three significant but entirely unrelated bills. That is why you are hearing people discuss highway funding; you are hearing people discuss the legislative branch, and you are hearing people discuss science.

On the day that DACA expansion and DAPA were scheduled to go into effect to make sure people here illegally can pay a fine, get right with the law, and be employed legally, rather than ille-

gally, we are doing nothing relating to restoring the rule of law and securing our borders or anything to address our broken immigration system.

We are making sure that Members of Congress and our staffs get paid. That is not the wrong thing. Our hard-working men and women who work here should get paid. It is a question of priorities. I would like to see us do something about the 10 or 12 million people here illegally before we start paying ourselves and our staff.

What about the highway trust fund? Again, this is an example of Congress kicking the ball down the road 2 months here, 2 months there, a month here, a month there. All the contractors and subcontractors don't even know how to present bids when they don't know whether a yearlong or 2-year project will be funded for more than 2 months. Taxpayers wind up paying more for the same amount of work because we lack the certainty.

Then there is the COMPETES Act—the science bill—which targets certain kinds of science which apparently Republicans don't like—for instance, the physical sciences and the geological sciences.

Handicapping the physical sciences hurts our ability to recognize the causes of things like wildfires and floods that affect my district in Colorado, foresee patterns leading to events like the great Western drought in California. It seems like, if anything, there should be a focus on a very relevant form of science that impacts quality of life every day.

They also apparently don't like, for political reasons, the social sciences. Again, going after the social sciences would harm our ability to adapt for historic storms like Hurricane Sandy or the flood in New Orleans with Katrina and mitigate against floods like those in Colorado.

There is an interface between the physical sciences and people, and that is the work of the social science programs: how public health looks, how flood evacuations look, how disease control looks.

These are important considerations and should not be politicized by this body, which is why not only I oppose this bill, but dozens of the largest scientific associations and coalitions oppose this bill that ostensibly is for the cause of science.

Having all these bills under this rule is what we call a grab-bag approach, just jamming unrelated legislation into ineffective packages that seem to confuse and muddle the meaningful debate that needs to occur.

Since 2011, when Republicans won the majority of the House, this practice of jamming several unrelated bills together into one rule has increased by 400 percent. This rule is an example of that, and it is why the American people suffer from the somewhat disjointed debate around it—one person talks about highways; another counters a point about science; another

talks about the legislative branch. It is because they are all in here. This is a Christmas tree bill.

Now, if it had immigration reform in it, I would support this Christmas tree. I could swallow the others if that was in here. I offered that to the gentleman from Washington, but unfortunately, it is not, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, the very people that should be benefiting from the bills we are reviewing today, like scientists, are actually opposing the bills. That should be a signal that this body is not understanding or heeding the needs of the American people.

We can reject this rule. We can tell Congress to get back on course. We can tell Congress to do a long-term reauthorization of transportation funding. We can tell Congress to pass a COMPETES Act that actually fosters innovation and makes America more competitive and a legislative branch appropriations bill that furthers the ability of this body to deliberate and be a model employer for those who work here.

How do we do that, Mr. Speaker? We do that by rejecting this rule.

If we can bring down this grab-bag, Christmas tree rule, we can set this Congress right.

I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Americans have sent us here to get things done. They are tired of gridlock. And we, in the 114th Congress, are on track to be one of the most productive Congresses in modern history.

House Republicans have an aggressive and forward-looking agenda which will help our economy recover and help create high-paying American jobs.

The use of the compound rule, which provides for separate consideration of each underlying measure under a single rule, helps expedite legislative business.

The consideration of one rule allows the House more time to debate the underlying measures, or to consider additional legislative business. We have a lot to do, and this is an efficient way to get our work done.

I appreciate the discussion that we have had over the last hour. And although we may have our differences of opinion, I believe that this rule and the underlying bills are strong measures that are important to the future of our country.

This rule provides for ample debate on the floor: the opportunity to debate and vote on three bills and numerous amendments sponsored by both Democrat and Republican Members of this Chamber. This rule will provide for a smooth and deliberative process for sending these bills to the Senate for their consideration.

These bills are solid and substantial measures that will address several critical issues facing our country.



H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, is a pro-science bill that will keep America competitive in the 21st century global economy by prioritizing taxpayer investments in basic research without increasing overall Federal spending.

H.R. 2250, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 2016, keeps funding for the legislative branch level with fiscal years 2014 and 2015 and will be used efficiently and effectively for the operations of the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, will allow transportation spending to continue through July while we in Congress work diligently toward a next step to close the shortfall in the highway trust fund.

Currently, highway and transit spending authority expires at the end of this month, and officials at the Department of Transportation are concerned that Federal cash infusions to transportation projects in my State and around the country would slow or even halt as the summer construction season begins unless we extend this temporary extension.

Overall, this is a strong rule that provides for consideration of three important bills, and I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 271 and the underlying bills.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Act of 2015, a bill that was originally written to provide much needed support for our nation's research and development activities in science and engineering.

I thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for the opportunity to speak on the Rules for H.R. 1806.

The America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015 as written raises serious concerns among the representatives from the scientific, academic, and business communities.

The groups that oppose the bill include the American Physical Society, the American Geophysical Union, the American Anthropological Association, the Association of American Universities, and the Consortium of Social Science Associations.

Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Ranking Member on the House Science Committee, the committee that authored the bill, will be offering a Managers Amendment to this bill.

The Administration has also signaled that it will not support the bill in its current form.

According to the Union of Concerned Scientists, the bill: reduces funding for several scientific disciplines; curtails the ability of federal agencies to pursue climate science; and adds burdensome new requirements to the way the National Science Foundation operates.

Perhaps most worrisome, the legislation would prevent the federal government from using Department of Energy-sponsored research to make policy.

My amendments offered for inclusion in the Rule to H.R. 1806 were simple and would have improved the bill by addressing the STEM education and training gap.

These Jackson Lee amendments focus on reducing the STEM gap that currently exists

between people of different geographic regions and socio-economic backgrounds.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics, reports that as many as 1.4 million new computer science jobs could soon be available in the United States, but only 400,000 students will be enrolled in programs at colleges and universities that would prepare them to take these jobs.

This disparity is often referred to as the STEM gap.

Only 1 out of 10 high schools in the U.S. offer computer science programs.

It is estimated that the education systems in 25 states do not count computer science classes toward high school graduation.

Both economists and business leaders have identified that the future of the American economy will 130 in STEM fields, which the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates will create more than 9 million jobs between 2012 and 2022.

The STEM gap is more pronounced when considering minority groups.

U.S. Census 2010 data from the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Census Bureau, showed that underrepresented minorities earned 18.6 percent of total undergraduate degrees from 4-year colleges, but only 16.4 percent of the degrees in science fields and less than 13 percent of degrees in physical sciences and engineering.

Many historically underrepresented groups, including low income urban, rural and Native American communities have difficulty accessing STEM education and job training opportunities.

By including all of the Jackson Lee Amendments in the Rule the committee could have made significant progress in reducing the STEM gap underserved populations with the chance to participate in the economy of the future.

Jackson Lee Amendments offered on H.R. 1806, included: Jackson Lee Amendment #3, which the Rules Committee has included in the Rule for the bill would create state and regional workshops to train K-12 teachers in project-based science and technology learning, which will allow them to provide instruction in initiating robotics and other STEM competition team development programs.

This amendment also leverages the collaboration among higher education, businesses, local private and public education agencies to support STEM efforts at schools located in areas with unemployment is 1 percent or more above the national rate.

Robotics competitions and other similar competitive opportunities have proven to be one of the most successful paths for engaging young minds in STEM education.

Competitions such as FIRST, a national robotics competition that engages 400,000 students each year and awards millions of dollars in scholarships are paving the way for future STEM success.

Jackson Lee Amendments Not included in the Rule: Jackson Lee Amendment #17 would have increased awareness among underrepresented groups in STEM employment and education opportunities by providing information on certification, undergraduate and graduate STEM programs.

One of the most enduring difficulties faced by underrepresented populations is a lack of awareness and understanding of the connection between STEM and employment opportunities.

In 2012, a survey found that despite the nation's growing demand for more workers in

science, technology, engineering, and math, the skills gap among the largest ethnic and racial minorities groups remain stubbornly wide.

Blacks and Latinos account for only 7 percent, of the STEM workforce despite representing 28 percent of the U.S. population.

Jackson Lee Amendment #18 would have made sure that the issue of reducing the skills and education gap of underrepresented groups in STEM degree programs is considered as current STEM education federal programs were reviewed.

Jackson Lee Amendment #19 could have furthered the skills development and training of teachers who provide instruction in K-12 STEM courses where 40 percent of the students are on free or reduced lunch programs or in areas where unemployment is 1 percent or more above the national average.

Although most STEM specific education occurs in college and graduate school, interest in STEM fields must be fostered from a young age through successful K-12 programs.

Many schools serving low-income students lack the resources to provide continuity of STEM K-12 education, and as a result, students lose the opportunity to develop the skills that will prepare them for higher STEM education.

Jackson Lee Amendment #21 was an effort to identify no-cost or low-cost summer and after school science and technology education programs and have that information broadly disseminated to the public.

Throughout primary and secondary education, skills retention is one of the most pressing concerns facing underrepresented students.

Without access to after-school and summer programs, even those students with a passion for STEM risk falling behind their peers.

Jackson Lee Amendment #22 made grants available to local education agencies to support training in STEM education methods to teachers to improve their instruction at schools serving neglected, delinquent, and migrant students, English learners, at-risk students, and Native Americans as determined by the director.

Jackson Lee Amendment #23 establishes within the Directorate for Education and Human Resources an Office of STEM Education Gap Awareness with the duties of reducing the STEM gap in K-12 and post-secondary education among underrepresented populations.

The Jackson Lee amendments are intended to bridge the STEM gap in rural and urban areas where opportunities for training in STEM that can enhance the productivity of businesses large and small are lacking.

The Brookings' Metropolitan Policy Program's report "The Hidden STEM Economy," reported that in 2011, 26 million jobs or 20 percent of all occupations required knowledge in 1 or more STEM areas.

Half of all STEM jobs are available to workers without a 4 year degree and these jobs pay on average \$53,000 a year, which is 10 percent higher than jobs with similar education requirements.

There will be STEM winners and losers not because the skills needed are too difficult to obtain, but because people are not aware of the jobs that are going unfilled today nor do they know what education or training will create job security for the next 2 to 3 decades.

I am very aware of the importance of STEM job training and education.

A third of Houston jobs are in STEM-based fields.

Houston has the second largest concentrations of engineers (22.4 for every 1,000 workers according to the Greater Houston Partnership).

Houston has 59,070 engineers, the second largest population in the nation.

STEM jobs are at the core of Houston's economic success, but what we have done with STEM innovation and job creation in the city of Houston is not enough to satisfy the region's demand for STEM trained workers.

Houston anticipates that in the next 5 years the gap in the number of people with STEM skills and training will not keep up with the number of positions requiring those skills.

This is not just true for Houston, Texas—it is true for every region of the nation—whether you live in a rural community or urban center.

By 2018 the United States will need: 710,000 Computing workers; 160,000 Engineers; 70,000 Physical Scientists; 40,000 Life Science workers; 20,000 Mathematics workers.

STEM Computing Jobs are critical to America's future: Software engineers; Computer networking workers; Systems analysis; Computer researcher or support workers.

Types of STEM Engineering Jobs: Structural Engineers; Mechanical Engineers; Software Engineers; Electrical Engineers; Automotive Engineers; Aeronautical Engineers; Naval Engineers; Architects.

Types of STEM Physical Sciences Jobs: Biologists; Zoologists; Agricultural; Food Scientists; Conservation Scientists; Medical Scientists; Climatologists.

Types of STEM Life Scientists [PhDs]: Political Science; Economists; Anthropologists; Archaeology; Cultural Researchers; Language Experts (Linguistic and Language Skills).

Types of STEM Mathematics: Teachers; Physicists; Cryptographers; Statisticians; Accountants.

In order to ensure that underserved populations reach the level of STEM education and opportunity they choose to pursue, I believe it is integral to create an office that will focus on closing the STEM education gap.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 178.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 179, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]

YEAS—242

Abraham	Amash	Barletta
Aderholt	Amodei	Barr
Allen	Babin	Barton

Benishak	Bilirakis	Bishop (MI)	Bishop (UT)	Black	Blackburn	Blum	Bost	Boustany	Brady (TX)	Brat	Bridenstine	Brooks (AL)	Brooks (IN)	Buchanan	Buck	Bucshon	Burgess	Byrne	Calvert	Carter (GA)	Carter (TX)	Chabot	Clawson (FL)	Coffman	Cole	Collins (GA)	Collins (NY)	Comstock	Conaway	Cook	Costello (PA)	Cramer	Crawford	Crenshaw	Culberson	Curbelo (FL)	Davis, Rodney	Denham	Dent	DeSantis	DesJarlais	Diaz-Balart	Dold	Duffy	Duncan (SC)	Duncan (TN)	Elmers (NC)	Emmer (MN)	Farenthold	Fincher	Fitzpatrick	Fleischmann	Fleming	Flores	Forbes	Fortenberry	Fox	Franks (AZ)	Frelinghuysen	Garrett	Gibbs	Gibson	Gohmert	Goodlatte	Gowdy	Granger	Graves (GA)	Graves (LA)	Graves (MO)	Griffith	Grothman	Guinta	Guthrie	Hanna	Hardy	Harper	Harris
Hartzler	Heck (NV)	Hensarling	Herrera Beutler	Hice, Jody B.	Hill	Holding	Hudson	Huelskamp	Huizenga (MI)	Hultgren	Hunter	Hurd (TX)	Hurt (VA)	Issa	Jenkins (KS)	Jenkins (WV)	Johnson (OH)	Johnson, Sam	Jolly	Jones	Jordan	Joyce	Katko	Kelly (PA)	King (IA)	King (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Kline	Knight	Labrador	LaMalfa	Lamborn	Lance	Latta	LoBiondo	Long	Loudermilk	Love	Lucas	Luetkemeyer	Lummis	MacArthur	Marchant	Marino	Massie	McCarthy	McCauley	McClintock	McHenry	McKinley	McMorris	Rodgers	McSally	Meadows	Meehan	Messer	Mica	Miller (FL)	Miller (MI)	Moolenaar	Mooney (WV)	Mullin	Mulvaney	Murphy (PA)	Neugebauer	Newhouse	Noem	Nugent	Nunes	Olson	Palazzo	Palmer	Paulsen	Pearce	Perry	Pittenger	Pitts

NAYS—179

Adams	Agullar	Ashford	Bass	Beatty	Becerra	Bera	Beyer	Bishop (GA)	Blumenauer	Bonamici	Boyle, Brendan F.	Brown (FL)	Brownley (CA)	Bustos	Butterfield	Capuano	Cardenas	Carney	Carson (IN)	Cartwright	Castor (FL)	Castro (TX)	Chu, Judy	Cicilline	Clark (MA)	Clarke (NY)	Clay	Cleaver	Clyburn	Cohen	Connolly	Conyers	Cooper	Costa	Courtney	Crowley	Cuellar	Cummings	Davis (CA)	Davis, Danny	DeFazio	DeGette	Delaney	DeLauro	DelBene	DeSaulnier	Dingell	Doggett	Doyle, Michael F.	Duckworth	Edwards	Ellison	Engel	Eshoo
-------	---------	---------	------	--------	---------	------	-------	-------------	------------	----------	-------------------	------------	---------------	--------	-------------	---------	----------	--------	-------------	------------	-------------	-------------	-----------	-----------	------------	-------------	------	---------	---------	-------	----------	---------	--------	-------	----------	---------	---------	----------	------------	--------------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	------------	---------	---------	-------------------	-----------	---------	---------	-------	-------

Esty	Farr	Fattah	Foster	Frankel (FL)	Fudge	Gabbard	Gallego	Garamendi	Graham	Grayson	Green, Al	Green, Gene	Grijalva	Gutierrez	Hahn	Heck (WA)	Higgins	Hinojosa	Honda	Hoyer	Huffman	Israel	Jackson Lee	Jeffries	Johnson (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Kaptur	Keating	Kelly (IL)	Kennedy	Kildee	Kilmer	Kind	Kirkpatrick	Kuster	Langevin	Larsen (WA)	Larson (CT)	Lawrence	Lee	Levin	Lewis	Lieu, Ted	Lipinski	Loebach	Lofgren	Lowenthal	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Lynch	Maloney	Carolyn	Maloney, Sean	Matsui	McCollum	McDermott	McGovern	McNerney	Meeks	Meng	Moulton	Murphy (FL)	Nadler	Napolitano	Neal	Nolan	Norcross	O'Rourke	Pallone	Pascarella	Payne	Pelosi	Perlmutter	Peters	Peterson	Pingree	Pocan	Polis	Price (NC)	Quigley	Rangel
Rice (NY)	Richmond	Royal-Allard	Ruiz	Ruppersberger	Rush	Ryan (OH)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Sarbanes	Schakowsky	Schiff	Schrader	Scott (VA)	Scott, David	Serrano	Sewell (AL)	Sherman	Sires	Slaughter	Smith (WA)	Speier	Swalwell (CA)	Takai	Takano	Thompson (CA)	Thompson (MS)	Titus	Tonko	Torres	Van Hollen	Vargas	Veasey	Vela	Velázquez	Visclosky	Walz	Wasserman	Schultz	Waters, Maxine	Watson Coleman	Welch	Wilson (FL)																																								

NOT VOTING—11

Brady (PA)	Donovan	Sanchez, Loretta
Capps	Gosar	Tsongas
Chaffetz	Hastings	Yarmuth
Deutch	Moore	

□ 1359

Ms. CLARKE of New York, Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, and HONDA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 178) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 3, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 244]

YEAS—420

Abraham	Ashford	Becerra
Adams	Babin	Benishak
Aderholt	Barletta	Bera
Aguilar	Barr	Beyer
Allen	Barton	Bilirakis
Amash	Bass	Bishop (GA)
Amodei	Beatty	Bishop (MI)

Bishop (UT) Fitzpatrick  
Black Fleischmann  
Blackburn Fleming  
Blum Flores  
Blumenauer Forbes  
Bonamici Fortenberry  
Bost Foster  
Boustany Foxx  
Boyle, Brendan Frankel (FL)  
F. Franks (AZ)  
Brady (TX) Frelinghuysen  
Brat Fudge  
Bridenstine Gabbard  
Brooks (AL) Gallego  
Brooks (IN) Garamendi  
Brown (FL) Garrett  
Brownley (CA) Gibbs  
Buchanan Gibson  
Buck Gohmert  
Bucshon Goodlatte  
Burgess Gosar  
Bustos Gowdy  
Butterfield Graham  
Byrne Granger  
Calvert Graves (GA)  
Capuano Graves (LA)  
Cárdenas Graves (MO)  
Carney Green, Al  
Carson (IN) Green, Gene  
Carter (GA) Griffith  
Carter (TX) Grijalva  
Carterwright Grothman  
Castor (FL) Guinta  
Castro (TX) Guthrie  
Chabot Gutiérrez  
Chu, Judy Hahn  
Cicilline Hanna  
Clark (MA) Hardy  
Clarke (NY) Harper  
Clawson (FL) Harris  
Clay Hartzler  
Clever Heck (NV)  
Clyburn Heck (WA)  
Coffman Hensarling  
Cohen Herrera Beutler  
Cole Hice, Jody B.  
Collins (GA) Higgins  
Collins (NY) Hill  
Comstock Himes  
Conaway Hinojosa  
Connolly Holding  
Cook Honda  
Cooper Hoyer  
Costa Hudson  
Costello (PA) Huelskamp  
Courtney Huffman  
Cramer Huizenga (MI)  
Crawford Hultgren  
Crenshaw Hunter  
Crowley Hurd (TX)  
Cuellar Hurt (VA)  
Culberson Israel  
Cummings Issa  
Curbelo (FL) Jackson Lee  
Davis (CA) Jeffries  
Davis, Danny Jenkins (KS)  
Davis, Rodney Jenkins (WV)  
DeFazio Johnson (GA)  
DeGette Johnson (OH)  
Delaney Johnson, E. B.  
DeLauro Johnson, Sam  
DelBene Jolly  
Denham Jones  
Dent Jordan  
DeSantis Joyce  
DeSaulnier Kaptur  
DesJarlais Katko  
Deutch Keating  
Diaz-Balart Kelly (IL)  
Dingell Kelly (PA)  
Doggett Kennedy  
Dold Kildee  
Doyle, Michael Kilmer  
F. Kind  
Duckworth King (IA)  
Duffy King (NY)  
Duncan (SC) Kinzinger (IL)  
Duncan (TN) Kirkpatrick  
Edwards Kline  
Ellison Knight  
Ellmers (NC) Kuster  
Emmer (MN) Labrador  
Engel LaMalfa  
Eshoo Lamborn  
Esty Lance  
Farenthold Langevin  
Farr Larsen (WA)  
Fattah Larson (CT)  
Fincher Latta

Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lummis  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Nugent  
Nunes  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Pascarell  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Price, Tom  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (NY)

Rice (SC)  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Russell  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano

Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Vargas

Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

NAYS—3

Conyers

NOT VOTING—9

Brady (PA)  
Capps  
Chaffetz

Donovan  
Grayson  
Hastings

Scott (VA)

Moore  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Tsongas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1407

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTION TO RECOMMIT ON H.R. 2353, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on H.R. 2353 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2015

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 2353.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 271, I call up the bill (H.R. 2353) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2353

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015”.

(b) RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Transportation shall reduce the amount apportioned or allocated for a program, project, or activity under this Act in fiscal year 2015 by amounts apportioned or allocated pursuant to the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014, including the amendments made by that Act, for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; reconciliation of funds; table of contents.

#### TITLE I—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

##### Subtitle A—Federal-Aid Highways

Sec. 1001. Extension of Federal-aid highway programs.

Sec. 1002. Administrative expenses.

##### Subtitle B—Extension of Highway Safety Programs

Sec. 1101. Extension of national highway traffic safety administration highway safety programs.

Sec. 1102. Extension of Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration programs.

Sec. 1103. Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act.

##### Subtitle C—Public Transportation Programs

Sec. 1201. Formula grants for rural areas.

Sec. 1202. Apportionment of appropriations for formula grants.

Sec. 1203. Authorizations for public transportation.

Sec. 1204. Bus and bus facilities formula grants.

##### Subtitle D—Hazardous Materials

Sec. 1301. Authorization of appropriations.

#### TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS

Sec. 2001. Extension of Highway Trust Fund expenditure authority.

#### TITLE I—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

##### Subtitle A—Federal-Aid Highways

SEC. 1001. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001(a) of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1840) is amended by striking “May 31, 2015” and inserting “July 31, 2015”.

##### (b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 1001(b)(1) of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1840) is amended by striking “for the period beginning on

October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015, a sum equal to  $\frac{243}{365}$  of the total amount” and inserting “for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015, a sum equal to  $\frac{304}{365}$  of the total amount”.

(2) GENERAL FUND.—Section 1123(h)(1) of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 202 note) is amended by striking “and \$19,972,603 out of the general fund of the Treasury to carry out the program for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” and inserting “and \$24,986,301 out of the general fund of the Treasury to carry out the program for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015”.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001(c)(1) of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1840) is amended—

(A) by striking “May 31, 2015,” and inserting “July 31, 2015,”; and

(B) by striking “ $\frac{243}{365}$ ” and inserting “ $\frac{304}{365}$ ”.

(2) OBLIGATION CEILING.—Section 1102 of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 104 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) \$33,528,284.932 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”;

(B) in subsection (b)(12) by striking “, and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015, only in an amount equal to \$639,000,000, less any reductions that would have otherwise been required for that year by section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a), then multiplied by  $\frac{243}{365}$  for that period” and inserting “, and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015, only in an amount equal to \$639,000,000, less any reductions that would have otherwise been required for that year by section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a), then multiplied by  $\frac{304}{365}$  for that period”;

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “May 31, 2015,” and inserting “July 31, 2015,”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending May 31, 2015, that is equal to  $\frac{243}{365}$  of such unobligated balance” and inserting “for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015, that is equal to  $\frac{304}{365}$  of such unobligated balance”; and

(D) in subsection (f)(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “May 31, 2015,” and inserting “July 31, 2015.”.

**SEC. 1002. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**

Section 1002 of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1842) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking “for administrative expenses of the Federal-aid highway program \$292,931,507 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “for administrative expenses of the Federal-aid highway program \$366,465,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”; and

(2) by striking subsection (b)(2) and inserting the following:

“(2) for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015, subject to the limitations on administrative expenses under the heading ‘Federal Highway Administration’ in appropriations Acts that apply to that period.”.

**Subtitle B—Extension of Highway Safety Programs**

**SEC. 1101. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.**

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.—

(1) HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 31101(a)(1)(C) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

“(C) \$195,726,027 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”.

(2) HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 31101(a)(2)(C) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

“(C) \$94,531,507 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”.

(3) NATIONAL PRIORITY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 31101(a)(3)(C) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

“(C) \$226,542,466 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”.

(4) NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER.—Section 31101(a)(4)(C) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

“(C) \$4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”.

(5) HIGH VISIBILITY ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM.—

(A) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 31101(a)(5)(C) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

“(C) \$24,153,425 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”.

(B) LAW ENFORCEMENT CAMPAIGNS.—Section 2009(a) of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note) is amended—

(i) in the first sentence by striking “May 31, 2015” and inserting “July 31, 2015”; and

(ii) in the second sentence by striking “May 31, 2015,” and inserting “July 31, 2015.”.

(6) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 31101(a)(6)(C) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

“(C) \$21,238,356 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”.

(b) COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—Section 403(f)(1) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$1,664,384 of the total amount available for apportionment to the States for highway safety programs under section 402(c) in the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$2,082,192 of the total amount available for apportionment to the States for highway safety programs under section 402(c) in the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 23.—Section 31101(c) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended by striking “May 31, 2015,” and inserting “July 31, 2015.”.

**SEC. 1102. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS.**

(a) MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS.—Section 31104(a)(10) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(10) \$181,567,123 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 31104(i)(1)(J) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(J) \$215,715,068 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”.

(c) GRANT PROGRAMS.—

(1) COMMERCIAL DRIVER'S LICENSE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(1) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking “and \$19,972,603 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” and inserting “and \$24,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015”.

(2) BORDER ENFORCEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(2) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1715) is

amended by striking “and \$21,304,110 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” and inserting “and \$26,652,055 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015”.

(3) PERFORMANCE AND REGISTRATION INFORMATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 4101(c)(3) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking “and \$3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” and inserting “and \$4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015”.

(4) COMMERCIAL VEHICLE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND NETWORKS DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM.—Section 4101(c)(4) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking “and \$16,643,836 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” and inserting “and \$20,821,918 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015”.

(5) SAFETY DATA IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(5) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking “and \$1,997,260 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” and inserting “and \$2,498,630 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015”.

(d) HIGH-PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.—Section 31104(k)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and up to \$9,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and up to \$12,493,151 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”.

(e) NEW ENTRANT AUDITS.—Section 31144(g)(5)(B) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and up to \$21,304,110 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and up to \$26,652,055 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”.

(f) OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.—Section 4127(e) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1741) is amended by striking “and \$2,663,014 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$3,331,507 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”.

(g) GRANT PROGRAM FOR COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS.—Section 4134(c) of SAFETEA-LU (49 U.S.C. 31301 note) is amended by striking “and \$665,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$832,877 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”.

**SEC. 1103. DINGELL-JOHNSON SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACT.**

Section 4 of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “May 31, 2015” and inserting “July 31, 2015”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A) by striking “May 31, 2015,” and inserting “July 31, 2015.”.

**Subtitle C—Public Transportation Programs**

**SEC. 1201. FORMULA GRANTS FOR RURAL AREAS.**

Section 5311(c)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking “and \$3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking “and \$16,643,836 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$20,821,918 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”.

**SEC. 1202. APPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FORMULA GRANTS.**

Section 5336(h)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$19,972,603 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$24,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”.

**SEC. 1203. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.**

(a) **FORMULA GRANTS.**—Section 5338(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “and \$5,722,150,685 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” and inserting “and \$7,158,575,342 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking “and \$85,749,041 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$107,274,521 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,”;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking “and \$6,657,534 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$8,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,”;

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking “and \$2,968,361,507 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$3,713,505,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,”;

(D) in subparagraph (D) by striking “and \$171,964,110 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$215,132,055 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,”;

(E) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) by striking “and \$404,644,932 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$506,222,466 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,”;

(ii) by striking “and \$19,972,603 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$24,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,”; and

(iii) by striking “and \$13,315,068 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$16,657,534 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,”;

(F) in subparagraph (F) by striking “and \$1,997,260 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$2,498,630 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,”;

(G) in subparagraph (G) by striking “and \$3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,”;

(H) in subparagraph (H) by striking “and \$2,563,151 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$3,206,575 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,”;

(I) in subparagraph (I) by striking “and \$1,441,955,342 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$1,803,927,671 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,”;

(J) in subparagraph (J) by striking “and \$284,809,315 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$356,304,658 for the period be-

ginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,”; and

(K) in subparagraph (K) by striking “and \$350,119,726 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$438,009,863 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,”.

(b) **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT DEMONSTRATION AND DEPLOYMENT PROJECTS.**—Section 5338(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$46,602,740 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” and inserting “and \$58,301,370 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015”.

(c) **TRANSIT COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM.**—Section 5338(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$4,660,274 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” and inserting “and \$5,830,137 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015”.

(d) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT.**—Section 5338(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$4,660,274 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” and inserting “and \$5,830,137 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015”.

(e) **HUMAN RESOURCES AND TRAINING.**—Section 5338(e) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” and inserting “and \$4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015”.

(f) **CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS.**—Section 5338(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$1,269,591,781 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” and inserting “and \$1,558,295,890 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015”.

(g) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Section 5338(h) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “and \$69,238,356 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” and inserting “and \$86,619,178 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015”;

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking “and not less than \$3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and not less than \$4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,”; and

(3) in paragraph (3) by striking “and not less than \$665,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and not less than \$832,877 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,”.

**SEC. 1204. BUS AND BUS FACILITIES FORMULA GRANTS.**

Section 5339(d)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “and \$43,606,849 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$54,553,425 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,”;

(2) by striking “\$832,192 for such period” and inserting “\$1,041,096 for such period”; and

(3) by striking “\$332,877 for such period” and inserting “\$416,438 for such period”.

**Subtitle D—Hazardous Materials****SEC. 1301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5128(a)(3) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(3) \$35,615,474 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”.

(b) **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND.**—Section 5128(b)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) **FISCAL YEAR 2015.**—From the Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Fund established under section 5116(i), the Secretary may expend for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015—

“(A) \$156,581 to carry out section 5115;

“(B) \$18,156,712 to carry out subsections (a) and (b) of section 5116, of which not less than \$11,368,767 shall be available to carry out section 5116(b);

“(C) \$124,932 to carry out section 5116(f);

“(D) \$520,548 to publish and distribute the Emergency Response Guidebook under section 5116(i)(3); and

“(E) \$832,877 to carry out section 5116(j).”.

(c) **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TRAINING GRANTS.**—Section 5128(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$2,663,014 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” and inserting “and \$3,331,507 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.”.

**TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS****SEC. 2001. ESTABLISHMENT OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.**

(a) **HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.**—Section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “June 1, 2015” in subsections (b)(6)(B), (c)(1), and (e)(3) and inserting “August 1, 2015”, and

(2) by striking “Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014” in subsections (c)(1) and (e)(3) and inserting “Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015”.

(b) **SPORT FISH RESTORATION AND BOATING TRUST FUND.**—Section 9504 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014” each place it appears in subsection (b)(2) and inserting “Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015”, and

(2) by striking “June 1, 2015” in subsection (d)(2) and inserting “August 1, 2015”.

(c) **LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.**—Section 9508(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “June 1, 2015” and inserting “August 1, 2015”.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015. This bill will extend the Federal surface transportation programs for 2 months, through July of 2015.

H.R. 2353 is a clean extension of the surface transportation programs, funded at the authorized amounts for fiscal year 2014. No transfer of funding to the highway trust fund is necessary because the trust fund will remain solvent during the period. However, we will more than likely have to pass another short-term patch before the August recess and take steps to ensure the trust fund remains solvent. I hope all of you will support H.R. 2353.

I have to say, a short-term extension through the end of July was not our

preferred path forward. Our hope was to extend the surface programs through the end of the calendar year. That would have ensured reliable funding for the States through the construction season. A longer extension would also have allowed us to focus on finding a long-term funding solution within the context of tax reform without the distraction of needing to address a shortfall in the highway trust fund later this summer. Unfortunately, we were unable to reach an agreement on a 7-month extension, and so we are left with a 2-month patch.

Mr. Speaker, we have an immediate, critical need to extend the current surface transportation law. If Congress fails to act, over 4,000 Department of Transportation personnel will be furloughed and the States will not be able to be reimbursed. Transportation projects and jobs across the country will be at risk.

I appreciate Chairman RYAN's attention to this pressing issue, as well as his commitment to addressing the long-term solvency of the highway trust fund. A long-term reauthorization bill will continue to be a top priority for this committee. I look forward to working with Chairman RYAN, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and others to achieve a long-term bill.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, here we are again, yet another short-term pass. It is a heck of a way to run a great nation. Our system is falling apart: 140,000 bridges on the National Highway System need repair or replacement; 40 percent of the surface National Highway System is in such bad shape we have to dig up the roadbed and resurface; and we have an \$86 billion backlog in transit just to bring the existing transit up to a state of good repair. It is so bad that we are killing people in the Nation's Capital unnecessarily because of the state of disrepair of the Metro system.

It is embarrassing. The United States of America has gone from number one in the world, unparalleled in terms of its infrastructure in the Eisenhower era and through a good deal of the latter part of the last century, to 26th and falling fast. We are investing less of a percentage of our GDP in infrastructure repairs and maintenance—let alone, building out a new system—than virtually every nation in the world.

□ 1415

We are down to around 1 percent. There are many developing nations who are investing much, much more because they know they have to move their people and their goods more efficiently in a world economy.

We cannot continue to kick this can down the road. The road is at a dead end. Today, we will reluctantly go along with a 2-month patch because, if we do not act today, at the end of this month, June 1, 4,000 people will be laid

off at DOT and all Federal funding for surface transportation and transit would stop. That would be the end of it. It wouldn't be authorized.

States that had bills pending couldn't be paid, and States that want to get new commitments for new projects wouldn't be able to do it, a tragedy at the height of the construction season. Sixty days should be enough time to negotiate a long-term bill.

Today, we introduce the GROW AMERICA Act written by the administration. It has many, many good points to it, especially the spending levels. We need to enhance spending. We can't pretend, Oh, we are going to do more with less. We are past that point.

Look at what has happened to the purchasing power of the gas tax, which hasn't been changed since 1993, two and a half times faster road traffic volume is going up than we are dealing with the funding issues. We are in a huge deficit situation, and there are many, many ways—many of them proposed on a bipartisan basis—to deal with this. We should be able to work that out.

More importantly, this committee writes the policy. We introduced a bill today that sets the levels for \$87 billion. It is an increase in transit to deal with the backlog, an increase in highways to deal with the insufficiencies there, a new dedicated program for freight; and it puts some more money into rail—commuter rail, in particular—to deal with positive train control and other issues.

We believe that this is the last wake-up call to give Congress time. Sixty days is more than enough time to write a long-term authorization and for the Ways and Means Committee to figure out a way to fund it.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank, in addition to this patch, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman RYAN for their very hard work towards a long-term reauthorization of the Federal highway bill.

Mr. Speaker, my home State of Missouri has nearly 35,000 highway miles and over 10,000 bridges that are practically begging for our attention. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, every single day I hear about the need to improve and repair our roadways in this country.

As you can imagine, this isn't a simple task. This is a job that is going to take years to complete. It requires the hard work and cooperation of thousands of men and women and relies on partnerships between the stakeholders, local governments, and Washington.

Most importantly, though, a task of this magnitude requires that those re-

sponsible for planning each project, the State and local governments, are able to do so with confidence. They need certainty not only in this year's budget, but also the budgets for the next 5 or 6 years.

This 2-month extension does not come under ideal circumstances, but it is going to ensure that States are reimbursed for their expenses on Federal projects, and it is going to give us the time to craft a bipartisan long-term reauthorization that we so desperately need.

Long-term reauthorization is critical for everyone who plays a role in improving our Nation's highways and bridges. For too long, they have been forced to operate off of short-term extension after short-term extension, and this makes the already difficult job of maintaining our roadways nearly impossible.

This Congress, we have a huge opportunity to secure a long-term highway bill that is going to improve, rebuild, and modernize America's highway system. It is time that we come together to do just that, and I hope this extension gives us the time to come up with that agreement that we need.

Again, I want to thank both chairmen for their hard work, and I look forward to finalizing a much-needed long-term reauthorization.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the ranking member of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

By July, when this new patch expires, Mr. Speaker, we shall have spent a full year since the last patch, not even trying to make progress toward a long-term authorization bill.

We have acquired a dangerous habit—33 since the last long-term bill—of patches that create no urgency to get a long-term bill done. The Ways and Means Committee, the funding committee for this bill, is holding its first hearing next month. The frustration in the States has accumulated as fast as the untenable backlog of projects. Another construction season has already been sacrificed.

The reason we are here is itself a comment on congressional neglect of the Nation's infrastructure. States have slowed down their request for reimbursements from the trust fund because the unreplenished fund, together with the short-term patches, make it impossible for States, themselves, to even begin projects of any size.

Mr. Speaker, the States have already scaled back their plans for 2015 that would have created jobs. This self-inflicted crisis is threatening other jobs, too—many Federal employees in my district and thousands of others throughout the country. If Congress fails to take action by May 31, many Federal employees will be furloughed; Federal reimbursements will stop, and the highway and transit programs will



shut down. The hidden costs are even worse, the many economic development projects in the country that can't be started until roads, bridges, and transit to accommodate them are done.

Today, the Democrats on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee have introduced the President's GROW AMERICA Act. We are putting a good bill on the table. Change it or do your own substitute, but do not leave the Nation's infrastructure twisting in the dust of another delay.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their hard work and to the rest of the committee for the hours of work already done on a long-term transportation bill.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2353 to prevent the shutdown of funding for infrastructure improvement. I believe there is shared commitment between the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and most of the Members of the House to pass a fully funded, multiyear highway bill.

With the debt crisis we continue to battle, it is becoming more and more difficult to find the much-needed resources for our most critical needs. That leaves few options at our immediate disposal, most of which are not palatable in this economic environment.

Members of both the Transportation Committee and the Ways and Means Committee will have to take a closer look at potential funding alternatives and be creative in how to finance a reliable and modern infrastructure system, and at the same time, we need to work towards getting our country back on a path of fiscal solvency.

As we work on a long-term solution, we should examine how to reform the highway trust fund to prevent finding ourselves in this same position over and over. A consistent funding mechanism, paired with a more transparent system that demonstrates effective use of taxpayer dollars, will put us in a better position to fund critical infrastructure projects and instill more confidence on the part of our constituents.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting H.R. 2353 so we can continue work on a multiyear transportation bill to ensure our Nation's growth. Failure to act threatens our general contractors and their employees, suppliers, and puts at risk the jobs that are both directly and indirectly supported by these projects.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to keep our folks in business and continue any meaningful growth in our economy, then we must find a reliable, long-term solution.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill to extend highway and transit programs for 2 months, but with reservations.

The last surface transportation bill, MAP-21, expired last fall. At that time, we passed an extension to the end of this month to give us time to work on a long-term bill. We have known for months that this day was coming; yet we have made no progress finding a solution to funding highways, transit, and other important surface transportation programs.

MAP-21, itself, was only a 2-year bill, breaking the tradition of Congress passing 5- or 6-year bills to provide the reliable funding necessary to promote long-term capital plans and projects that require a commitment beyond 1 fiscal year. The last long-term bill we passed was SAFETEA-LU in 2005. That was 10 years ago, and that bill was underfunded because of a resistance to raising the gasoline tax or to identifying new revenue sources.

For over a decade, we have failed to address the funding challenges necessary to break the cycle of underinvestment and put this country back on a competitive path with the rest of the world.

Today, we spend about 1.7 percent of GDP on infrastructure, while China spends 9 percent and Europe spends 4½ to 5 percent. We used to spend 4½ to 5 percent also.

According to DOT, there is an \$800 billion backlog of investment needs on highways and bridges, including \$479 billion in critical repair work. Public transit has an \$86 billion backlog of critical maintenance and repair needs, which increases by \$2.5 billion each year as bus and rail infrastructure ages.

While our infrastructure crumbles around us, House and Senate leadership refuse to come up with the additional \$60 billion needed to fill the gap in the highway trust fund just to do a long-term bill at current levels; but this week, they will put on the floor a tax extender that will cost \$182 billion over 10 years, completely unpaid for. The priorities of this Congress are completely out of whack.

I am concerned that we will pass this 2-month extension and be right back here in July having this same conversation. I will support this extension, but only with the understanding that we must spend the next 2 months, once and for all, making transportation funding a priority so that our citizens don't have to risk unsafe transportation so that we can invest in our infrastructure and we can be competitive in our economy going forward.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015.

Although we must construct a long-term highway bill, this legislation is a

compromise that will provide States with certainty through the vital summer construction months.

By extending the expenditure authority of the highway trust fund through the end of July, States will not have to worry about reimbursements from the Federal Government while they are in the middle of the busiest construction season of the year.

Following the passage of this extension, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to construct a long-term highway bill with a sustainable funding mechanism.

Upon its enactment in 2012, MAP-21 made important reforms by consolidating Federal highway programs and streamlining the project approval process. The next highway bill should build on MAP-21's successes to cut red tape and ensure highway trust fund dollars are spent responsibly.

We must also be good stewards of taxpayer dollars by keeping our promise to the American people that the next surface transportation bill will provide adequate funding for highway and freight infrastructure to create jobs and keep our Nation competitive.

My constituents and the hard-working people all over this country need reliable roads and bridges to commute to work, take their children to school, and get home safely at night.

Unfortunately, the President's funding proposal is not viable and, I believe, will encourage more inversions or takeovers of American companies.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2353 and encourage them to commit to crafting a long-term fiscally responsible highway bill that will provide the much-needed certainty to States, industry, and the American people.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, and I appreciate his leadership on this matter. He hit it right on the nail.

We are in a situation, I am sad to say, having listened to my colleague a moment ago; the States will still have to worry. Two months doesn't give them a straight shot at a construction season, and there is still uncertainty.

I could have dusted off the speech I gave last summer where I said we would be right back here in the same spot, with uncertainty around the country; and the local governments, the State governments, the contractors don't deserve that.

But it is not the problem of the T and I Committee, as much as Ways and Means. You can't craft a bill unless you know how much money you have got to spend. I am embarrassed as a member of that committee that, in the 55 months my Republican colleagues have been in charge, we have not had a single hearing on transportation finance.

We hear certain things are off the table or not acceptable. It is interesting, we haven't raised the gas tax in



22 years, but six States—six red States—have raised the gas tax already this year. Utah, Idaho, Georgia, South Dakota—these are not flaming bastions of liberalism. These are people who looked at the problem and decided they needed to step up, and they stepped up not to take the place of the Federal responsibility, but in anticipation that at some point, the Federal Government would meet its obligation for almost half of the major construction projects.

I would respectfully request that we dive in and see what we can do over the course of the next couple of months, but that the Ways and Means Committee spend one week listening to the men and women who build, operate, and use our Nation's infrastructure, spend a week, look at the items, consider maybe what Ronald Reagan thought was a good idea in 1982: raise the gas tax.

We can pass that bill out of committee in 1 week, and you can have the next couple of months to give America the bill it needs to rebuild and renew this great country.

□ 1430

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes from the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY).

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of long-term highway funding. I will support the bill on the floor today, but let's be clear. This is a long-term problem that needs to have a long-term solution.

We gather in hearings and we gather in meetings to discuss the various options we have for revenue. We now have to gather to make a decision, the long-term decision.

We were elected to Congress to represent our constituents and to make difficult decisions that will help us guide our Nation forward. It is time for us to accelerate and produce a solution to our highway funding problems. Our highways and our bridges are falling into disrepair.

Before I became involved in public service, I was a contractor in Nevada where I worked on roads, bridges, and dams. I know the wear and tear that our infrastructure is experiencing. I know the uncertainty that States are facing when it comes to highway projects.

Our inaction has created a difficult environment for the States to make decisions. So I stand here today to support long-term funding. It is a long-term problem that requires a long-term solution.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the leadership of this committee for getting to this point. I am very, very sorry that this is another kicking the can down the road, but we don't have much choice but to support the bill before us today.

We have missed a major construction season already. Bridges are falling; ac-

cidents are happening; traffic jams increase because of the crumbling infrastructure. This is all very costly, and it is more costly when we have a winter like we just had that hits already crumbling infrastructure.

We must address this costly neglect of our infrastructure around the country. It is not partisan. There are no Democrat and Republican bridges or streets. We must address our responsibility to this Nation.

Sensible, large projects must have time to plan for those long-term projects. They cannot do that. No city or State can do that kind of planning without knowing whether we have a long-term source of funding that will keep it going.

It is unwise for us to continue just to put this off. We have got to pay for it no matter when we do it. The time is now. We have extended this time too long. The Nation has suffered too long. Traffic is jamming; accidents are happening; and it will not get better until we take on our responsibility.

I would urge all of us today to support this short-term bill for the last time. It is time for us to have a long-term infrastructure bill for this Nation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the Chair the balance of time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 19 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. It is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, the funding and authorization for our Federal highway program expires in just 12 days. This is a deadline that Congress, the Department of Transportation, and the American people have known about for almost a year now. And the bill before us today is not the long-term solution that we were hoping for, but it is the necessary step forward at this time while we continue to work on a longer term solution for our highway funding.

I appreciate very much the attention that Chairman SHUSTER has given to this important issue. He has taken a very keen interest in what we need on a national level, and many of us from the Houston area appreciate his coming to our part of America to learn and see what our needs are in the State of Texas. I am confident that the chairman and those of us on the relevant committees in the House and the Senate will come together and deliver a long-term solution for our highway programs and will strengthen them for every Texan and every American.

While this bill before us isn't ideal, the choice is very simple. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on this bill to keep our State Department of Transportation on the job through the summer building months and to keep Congress working on a long-term solution.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, here we go again, passing another extension and failing in our duty to provide a world-class transportation system.

Transportation programs are much too critical to our economy to be delayed any longer. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership in Washington continues its long-running failure to fund surface transportation infrastructure programs. Just last week, House Republicans passed a bill, with no offsets, that cut taxes by \$269 billion for the richest 1 percent of Americans, but they failed to pass a real transportation authorization bill that would put Americans to work. We know, for every billion dollars we invest in transportation, it generates 44,000 permanent jobs.

In closing, Secretary Anthony Foxx said that all of us have roles to play in shaping our Nation's infrastructure. As we saw last week during the tragic train derailment in Philadelphia, Congress urgently needs to increase funding for our Nation's passenger rail system in order to make it safer for all of the traveling public and to prevent future tragedies on our Nation's rails.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Mr. DEFAZIO for yielding and for the work that he does on this committee.

Let me also say to the chairman of the committee, Mr. SHUSTER, how pleased I am with the kind of work that he does on the committee. Very frankly, Mr. SHUSTER is committed to getting things done and to working in a bipartisan fashion. That is good for this House, and it is good for his State, and it is good for the country. I thank him for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this 60-day extension because it is essential that we do this. The consequences of not doing it would be very, very negative. I rise to lament the fact that we have gone 10 months in our having known full well that this date was upon us and that theoretically, we thought, that funding as well as authorization would end on the 31st of this month. We have now found that funding will not end. This bill is necessary to authorize, not to fund, because funding is available for the next 60 days from the 31st.

I also rise to urge this House, under Mr. SHUSTER's and Mr. DEFAZIO's leadership, to do the work we were sent here to do—to invest in America, to invest in the growth of our economy, to invest in the creation of jobs—in fact, what the board of directors of the greatest country on the face of the Earth ought to have done many years and, certainly, months ago.

I am absolutely convinced that this House has the capacity, the intellect, and the ability within 60 days to come

to this floor with a bill that will invest in our infrastructure and provide sufficient funds to make America competitive and to pay for it, not to pass the expense along to future generations—my children, my grandchildren, my great grandchildren. They are going to have to buy for themselves the infrastructure of their generations, and they ought not to have to pay the bills of our generation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. It is a moral responsibility that this generation pays for the investments that it needs to make in the infrastructure that will be used today and tomorrow.

Mr. SHUSTER. I know, wants to do that. Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. DEFAZIO have the courage to do that. The issue is going to be whether this body, on both sides of the aisle, comes forward with a responsible, paid-for infrastructure bill, particularly for highways and roads and bridges, but for other investments as well.

I want to tell Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. DEFAZIO that I will work closely with them and that I will urge the Members on my side of the aisle to work closely with the Members on Mr. SHUSTER's side of the aisle to effect this end. But let us not pretend on July 30 that we can extend until December 31 or until a year from then. Today, let us commit ourselves to using the next 70 days, approximately, to come up with a paid-for, 6-year reauthorization that will make America stronger, grow our economy, and be a pride of the American people, whom we serve.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished whip for his kind words, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, again, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining on my side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), a member of the committee.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this failure to write a long-term, paid-for surface transportation bill for this country has become a national embarrassment. Quite frankly, it is an international embarrassment. Passenger trains and oil trains are coming off the tracks, are taking lives, are causing untold amounts of damage. The simple truth is that we can't fix those lives who were lost, but we can fix our transportation system. Isn't it about time that we do that? It is not only a national embarrassment, our failure here, but it is a failure of the Congress. It is a failure of the legislative process. It is a failure of the committee process. That is what is happening here.

We held hearings in the last session. We heard from the Chamber of Com-

merce; we heard from the unions; we heard from the retailers; we heard from the truckers. Everybody said three things: one, our transportation system is falling apart. They had that right. Two, it is hurting our ability to grow our economy and to create jobs. They had that right. Three, they said we need to find some new revenue. None of it could be more obvious. Yet the Transportation Committee held hearings from all of those people in the last session, and we held hearings again in this session, but we never took up the markup and the writing of a transportation bill.

□ 1445

That is the simple truth, Mr. Speaker, and I am calling on the leadership here to either instruct the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or allow the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to write a transportation bill. I have absolute confidence that we can come together if we do.

It is through the committee process that we find common ground. That is where we reach our bipartisanship. That is how we fix things here in the Congress. That is how we get things done. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, allow or instruct the committee to do its job, to do its business, and we will write a transportation plan for this country that gets this country moving again, saves lives, and builds an economy.

Mr. SHUSTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS), a member of the committee.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, why are we debating an extension of the surface transportation authorization instead of doing the right thing and passing a bill that invests in our future? We should be playing the long game, not betting on the come, as they say in Nevada.

For the 2 million residents who live in the Las Vegas valley and the more than 42 million visitors who come to our city from around the world, we must commit to the passage of a long-term surface transportation bill this summer. We can't do yet another extension that creates uncertainty, stifles development, and puts us further behind.

We must pass a bill that includes investment that is real, sustainable, and goes beyond just maintaining our current infrastructure but instead sets our Nation on a road that is built to last.

Mr. SHUSTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), a member of the committee.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I just want to start by thanking Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. DEFAZIO for their bipartisan leadership. I am going to vote for this 2-month extension for the highway trust fund in order to avoid a shutdown of America's transit building and repair.

But with that said, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is like fixing our roads and bridges with Silly Putty. It is just not strong enough to hold our Nation's crumbling infrastructure. So I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to say it is time to make those long-term investments necessary for people and goods to get to their destination safely and timely.

Mr. Speaker, transportation moves our economy. It is time for Congress to get going.

Mr. SHUSTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a strong advocate for all things transportation, a member of the powerful Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and the chairman. I am not going to vote for this piece of legislation—not even close.

Everyone talks about how we must maintain the roads. If you listened over the last 45 minutes, all of these infrastructure issues are in bad shape, terrible shape. We know the problem. So long speeches about this and the problem don't make much sense.

Here is my question to every Member of this body: What are you prepared to do? Make believe you are doing something? Hide under the desk in your office?

How much money have we used, Mr. Speaker, from the general fund to bail out transportation? The percentage of general funds increases each budget that we are using. So without a clear source of long-term funding, our States cannot plan for the future. In fact, many States are not putting money into their trust fund. My own State, the State of New Jersey, I guess the money is going to fall out of the sky. So 2 months, 4 months, 7 months, it is all a joke.

Ensuring the solvency of the trust fund is not only a key component of meeting our transportation challenges, it is our job. The Committee on Ways and Means has not even had one hearing, Mr. Ranking Member, Mr. Chairman. How many States have put themselves in the same position as the Federal Government?

I understand that some Members are already planning another short-term extension in July because you say now we are ready to have a long-term solution, but you are already planning for another short-term in July. In fact, we are moving towards the omnibus bill, where we will put everything together. It will be like a stew: trade, transportation, lollipops, put them all in there. Put it all in there, and then we will vote on it and have some of our Members vote against motherhood so that they will be on the block a year from this November.

Look, let me suggest something novel for this group. Let's spend the next 8 weeks resuscitating a system

where users of the system pay to maintain and grow the system. International tax can be a part of the solution. I say to the President and the Congress, it is not nearly enough money.

A group of us presented a bipartisan plan—Republicans and Democrats—to fund the Federal highway trust fund. Through Democratic Presidents, Republican Presidents, through Democratic Houses and Republican Houses, we have always been able to come to a resolution on this until the last 3 or 4 years. Why? Why is this?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, neither party has the wherewithal to deal with the problem. I believe our model must receive serious consideration as the clock counts down on the trust fund's expiration. Our legislation has the support of both business and labor.

I am done with extensions, and I plan to vote "no" today. I ask my colleagues to show support for a long-term bill and cosponsor the Renacci-Pascrell plan, because if we don't change something, we will be right back here in July talking to each other.

Mr. SHUSTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. How much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 20½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First off, I want to join in what many others have said: transportation infrastructure has not been historically nor should it become a partisan issue. I appreciate the chairman's willingness to work together on many aspects. We will at times disagree over elements of bills, but in general we agree that what makes this country great, what makes us competitive in the world is a world-class system of transportation infrastructure and other critical infrastructure, and today we are deficient. I talked during my introductory remarks about some of the needs. Let me just talk about the revenues.

Back in 1993, when the gas tax was raised by a bipartisan coalition in the House—actually, on the Republican side, led by the chairman's father, Bud Shuster—we paid about 14 percent. Every time you went to the pump, with the increase in the gas tax in 1993, 14 percent of your bill went to invest in the Nation's infrastructure. Yet today, some 22 years later, 7 percent goes to the infrastructure. Population has grown, road miles have increased, and the Eisenhower infrastructure has aged.

Infrastructure doesn't just age a little bit each year. It reaches a point where it accelerates dramatically, so a

bridge that you could fix for \$15 million or \$20 million today, 2 years from now you might have to totally replace for \$100 million. So not delaying these needed investments, unless we want to see people detouring around all the rivers in America because of bridge outages, is really, really critical for a just-in-time economy, for our world competitiveness, to save on fuel efficiency.

Now, a number of States have stepped in to fill the void; 14 States have voted to raise their own gas taxes since 2013. As the gentleman from Oregon pointed out, six deep red Republican States have voted to raise their gas tax this year.

Just to assure my colleagues, for those who raised it before the last election, nobody lost their election because they raised the gas tax in those States. People recognize it as a user fee. They are tired of blowing out tires and car repairs because of potholes. They are tired of detours. The trucking industry is tired of detours, and they don't want a proliferation of tolls across America. The solution is a Federal partnership.

The chairman held a hearing recently where we had the Department of Transportation director from Wyoming, a deep red State, talking about the fact that they had increased their gas tax, but they still need the Federal partnership; it is critical. We had the Governor of North Carolina—has one of the highest gas taxes in the country, deep red State these days—saying the Federal partnership was more critical than ever. The same with the mayor of Salt Lake City, the Federal partnership is critical. No State can do it on its own.

I propose that we index the gas tax to construction costs, inflation, fleet fuel economy. That would mean next year the gas tax would go up by 1.7 cents. I would like to see the Member of Congress who thinks they are going to lose their election over a 1.7 cent investment in America's infrastructure to avoid those potholes, the congestion, the detours, the delays, or the additional tolling to maintain what we have. It won't happen. It hasn't happened recently in red States that have raised it much more than 1.7 cents.

But if we index to inflation, fleet fuel economy, and construction costs inflation, we could borrow upfront for the trust fund, let's say, \$150 billion, a nice increase over the current levels of spending, and we could pay it back in about 15 years with that increment, just the indexed increment that would grow a tiny bit each year.

And again, you drive by the gas station on your way to work, and when you drive home at night, ExxonMobil has raised it a nickel because there were rumors of war in the Middle East or a refinery had an outage or something or this. Where did that nickel go? It went into the pockets of ExxonMobil or speculators on Wall Street. It didn't go into our Nation's infrastructure.

The American people would sure as heck rather pay 1.7 cents to rebuild our system and make America more com-

petitive and put hundreds of thousands of people to work than another nickel in the coffers of OPEC or ExxonMobil or Wall Street speculators.

It is time to suck it up around here, act like men and women who were sent here to make tough decisions, to regain our legacy, to begin to bring America back toward a world-class infrastructure. It would take many years and many tens or hundreds of billions of dollars to reclaim the legacy of the Eisenhower era, but it is only a lack of will—will—that prevents us from doing that. There is no major impediment. Nobody is going to lose their election over 1.7 cents a gallon. In fact, people will thank you at home.

The trucking industry is begging—begging—for an increase in the diesel tax. The United States Chamber of Commerce, when is the last time they asked for an increase in a tax? Look, all across the spectrum, the retailers, the business community, all across this country people are saying: Help us; get us out of congestion; fix the system; bring it up to a state of good repair. There is another whole contingent of American people who are saying: We need jobs.

There is no more certain way to create jobs in this country than investing in America's infrastructure. And they are not just construction jobs. They are engineering jobs. They are manufacturing jobs. In the case of mass transit, they are high-tech jobs. They are small business jobs. They are disadvantaged business enterprise jobs. It goes through the entire economy. No American will be left behind.

We could create hundreds of thousands of jobs and make America number one again. All we lack is the will here in this House. Let's say this is the last 60-day delay. Let's work together, and let's get a real 6-year bill by the end of July.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to announce we introduced the GROW AMERICA Act comprehensive bill with which we could begin policy discussions, H.R. 2410, today, with 19 cosponsors.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I always appreciate the passion of the ranking member, my friend, Mr. DEFAZIO, on these issues. I have to say that much of what has been said on this floor by both sides, I agree with. The need to invest in our infrastructure is real. It is critical. Our infrastructure is crumbling all around us.

I also agree that we need to find a long-term solution to the trust fund to make sure it is fiscally responsible, and most importantly, I agree that we need to act. This 2-month extension was not my preference. What my preference is, is to buckle down, work hard, find the dollars, and have a long-term surface transportation bill that is sustainable.

Again, I stand here today urging all my colleagues to vote for this essential

2-month extension to get us through to July. I am committed to continue to work to find the solution so we can have a long-term bill, but a vote against this bill is a vote in favor of shutting down these vital programs, stopping the work of thousands of highway projects around the country and laying off thousands of construction workers and Federal employees.

I urge a “yes” vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the highway trust fund has enough money to pay for projects through the end of July, but its legal authority to spend that money expires at the end of this month. I would have preferred to pass an extension that lasted through the end of the year, but we just couldn't come to a bipartisan agreement on how to pay for it. That's unfortunate because the more time we spend on these short-term patches, the less time we'll have to find a long-term solution.

And ultimately, the only real solution is a long-term solution. At the very least, this legislation will allow the trust fund to continue to fund projects through July, while we continue to work on an extension for the rest of the year. But if we really want to solve this problem, both parties need to confront the serious challenges facing the trust fund. That's the only way we'll come up with a plan to give states the certainty they need to build the roads and bridges our families need to thrive.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bill, H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015 but with reservations.

I support Chairman SHUSTER's efforts to ensure the Highway Bill does not expire and cost the economy jobs and cause important projects to stop progress.

I am, however, disappointed we once again face this issue.

We need to pass a long-term highway bill so that our communities and businesses have the certainty they need to invest in our future.

I understand the fiscal challenges we face but I believe that we must do more to improve our nation's transportation system.

Transportation funding, particularly for highways and transit, is particularly important for my constituents and the entirety of the Greater Houston area.

We have a congestion problem in Houston.

We have done a lot to reduce this congestion, but more must be done.

We also have the largest port for foreign tonnage and largest petrochemical complex in our country along the banks of the Port of Houston.

In the years ahead, we will face a much higher traffic volume due to population growth and the expansion of the Panama Canal, which will bring more truck traffic and economic development to the area.

In order for Houston and our Port to continue to be a hub for commerce, we must strengthen our rail and road infrastructure.

Both a successful port and a growing local economy rely on well maintained roads and bridges.

Communities around our country must improve its transportation infrastructure in order to encourage businesses and economic development.

While I understand the strain the Highway Trust Fund is experiencing, it is important that

we fund important highway projects throughout the country.

We are at a critical time for our nation in terms of transportation funding.

We must fix bridges, expand highways, and increase the capacity of our infrastructure.

Highway and transit projects are important to our constituents, so they can get to work and school and they are important to our businesses so they can move commerce.

Everyone wins when we increase our investments in our transportation infrastructure.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2353 but I also urge my colleagues to fix the problem and craft a long-term highway bill for the benefit of all our citizens.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2353. This bill will mark the thirty-third time we've passed a short-term extension to the Highway bill in eight years. Enough is enough. Our roads and bridges are crumbling. We owe it to the American people to pass a robust long-term surface transportation bill and make real investments in our transportation infrastructure. These short-term extensions not only diminish our economic competitiveness as a nation but they erode the safety of all of the folks we were sent here to represent. I will not support any more short-term gimmicks and implore my colleagues to join me in rejecting this proposal and instead pass a long-term bill and once again invest in our national infrastructure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. ESTY. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Esty moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2353 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of title I, add the following:

#### Subtitle E—Passenger Rail Positive Train Control Funding

#### SEC. 1401. PASSENGER RAIL POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL FUNDING.

Section 20158(c) of title 49, United States Code is amended by inserting “, and \$750,000,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” after “2013”.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will

not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

My amendment provides \$750 million to passenger railroads to help them implement positive train control. Tragically, last week, Amtrak 188 derailed, killing 8 people and injuring more than 200. My thoughts and prayers are with the victims and their loved ones.

Unfortunately, last week's tragic accident is just the latest in a series of incidents that are unacceptable and largely preventable.

According to National Transportation Safety Board member Robert Sumwalt, the lead investigator of last week's Amtrak derailment in Philadelphia: “Had PTC”—positive train control—“been installed on the section of track, this accident would not have occurred.”

Now, what is positive train control? Positive train control, commonly referred to as PTC, is a communications and signaling system that uses GPS technology and sensors to communicate train location, speed, restrictions, and moving authority.

Most importantly, PTC can save lives. For instance, positive train control technology can detect if a train is going too fast for an area and use on-board equipment to automatically slow or stop the train.

Now, Mr. Speaker, last week's derailment is not the first time NTSB has recommended implementing positive train control. This recommendation has been made since 1969, following an investigation of a head-on collision of two Penn Central commuter trains near Darien, Connecticut, in my home State. That collision killed 4 people and left 43 injured.

Forty-six years after that deadly collision in Connecticut, the NTSB is still demanding and waiting for action. During this time, the NTSB has investigated 144 accidents that would have been preventable if railroads had installed PTC. Not surprisingly, positive train control has been on the NTSB's most wanted list of safety improvements since 1990.

144 accidents over 43 years—try and think about that, and try to comprehend 6,532 preventable injuries and 288 preventable deaths.

This just isn't an issue only on the Northeast corridor. In 2008, a tragic accident in California killed 25 people and injured 102. After that accident, this House enacted legislation requiring PTC on commuter and intercity passenger rails by December 31 of this year; but protecting lives requires leadership from this Congress.

The American Public Transportation Association asked Congress to provide Federal funding for 80 percent of the installation costs on passenger rails. We in Congress can help. We can and must make this investment before another terrible accident, before another life is tragically and needlessly lost. We can't afford to wait.

Less than 2 years ago, a Metro-North Railroad engineer fell asleep as the train he was operating sped up to 82 miles an hour through a tight curve. The restriction for that section was only 30 miles an hour. As a result of the derailment, 4 people died, and 61 were injured. With tragic predictability, the NTSB investigation determined that positive train control could have prevented that tragedy as well.

How many more times does the NTSB need to repeat its recommendation before PTC is implemented?

There is no reason why this Congress should continue to ignore its responsibility to help passenger railroads implement the lifesaving technology as soon as possible.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment to provide the necessary funding to help passenger railroads implement PTC across the United States.

Let me be clear: this funding won't prevent every single accident. The fact that PTC will not prevent every accident should not—cannot—be an excuse for this Congress' failure to act.

Failure to act today on implementing positive train control is wrong. It is unworthy of a great country. A great country does not respond to crises with duct tape; a great country leads with action.

I ask all House Members to join me to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. SHUSTER. I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this motion. We certainly know of the tragedy that happened in Philadelphia, in my home State, but this really is not the place to address this.

We need to pass a clean extension. We have got to pass it and get it to the Senate, so we make sure that these vital programs keep people working, we keep projects moving forward, and that they don't shut down.

Again, this is a clean extension. We want it to be a clean extension because we know that time is of the essence to get this over to the Senate, as I said, and pass it. You are talking about 4,000 people in the government that will be furloughed and thousands of workers across America. Projects will stop, and they won't be working.

Again, we have an immediate need to extend the highway transit and safety programs. I am confident and remain committed to working with Chairman RYAN; but this is not the time to slow this down. This the time to get it done so that we can get it to the Senate as quickly as possible.

Again, I am opposed to this motion. I urge a "no" vote on the motion and

continue to ask my colleagues to support the underlying bill that gets the job done and gets us past this critical time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

#### CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE STABILIZATION OF IRAQ—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-40)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

##### *To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, is to continue in effect beyond May 22, 2015.

Obstacles to the orderly reconstruction of Iraq, the restoration and maintenance of peace and security in the country, and the development of political, administrative, and economic institutions in Iraq continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Accordingly, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 19, 2015.

#### LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on consideration of H.R. 2250, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 271 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2250.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1516

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2250) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. CARTER of Georgia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When I joined the Appropriations Committee a little over 4 years ago, I said that I wanted this committee to be known as a place where taxpayer money was saved and not spent. In recent years, there has been a major change in the perception of this committee.

Thanks in large part to the leadership of Chairman ROGERS and the members of the committee, the process is open, and it is transparent, and this committee has made a priority of ensuring every taxpayer dollar is spent wisely.

In keeping with that trend, the bill that we are here to debate today holds the line on spending. It is a bill that honors and respects the taxpayer while preserving the beauty of the Capitol campus, providing essential security for visitors and staff, and ensuring that we are able to provide the services that our constituents expect and deserve.

This bill is a total of \$3.3 billion for the legislative branch, excluding all Senate items. The bill continues the freeze on funding for the House of Representatives, including leadership, committees, and Member office budgets. It also continues the Member pay freeze that was put in place in 2010.

In all, this represents a 14 percent reduction in funding for the House of Representatives since Republicans have gained control of Congress in January of 2011.

Now, more specifically, this bill increases funding for the Capitol Police and allows small increases for several other agencies while trimming budgets in less critical areas.

This bill recognizes the continuing challenges faced by our Architect of the Capitol. There is a balance that must be struck between preserving these historic buildings and funding other critical projects, including life-safety projects.

Overall, the Architect's budget is one that was trimmed. This bill puts a new emphasis on transparency and accountability in major construction projects under the Architect. That is why this bill transitions to direct appropriations

for the Cannon restoration project, rather than continuing to use the House historic building revitalization fund. This change will significantly improve the committee's ability to provide oversight for this major project.

Additionally, this bill includes language that places a 25 percent cap on the amount available for larger projects within the legislative branch. In order to receive the remaining 75 percent of their appropriations, this new oversight feature requires a plan for any project over \$5 million to be submitted to the GAO and our committee for approval.

The plan must address any projected changes to the project's schedule and cost, and it must include a description of the safeguards taken to ensure that the project remains on time and on budget.

Now, regarding the Library of Congress, this bill includes funding to meet the Library's current needs, including an increase for the U.S. Copyright Office to reduce claims processing and analyze possible process improvements.

Additionally, the committee will be working with the Library in the upcoming months to track its progress in addressing its critical IT infrastructure problems which have been identified in a recent GAO report.

In closing, I would like to thank Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Chairman ROGERS, Mrs. LOWEY, and the members of our subcommittee and full committee and staff for their hard work throughout this entire process. This is a product that we can be proud of.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2250)  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
Payment to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress.....	---	---	174	+174	+174
Salaries and Expenses					
House Leadership Offices					
Office of the Speaker.....	6,645	6,645	6,645	---	---
Office of the Majority Floor Leader.....	2,180	2,180	2,180	---	---
Office of the Minority Floor Leader.....	7,114	7,114	7,114	---	---
Office of the Majority Whip.....	1,887	1,887	1,887	---	---
Office of the Minority Whip.....	1,460	1,460	1,460	---	---
Republican Conference.....	1,505	1,505	1,505	---	---
Democratic Caucus.....	1,487	1,487	1,487	---	---
Subtotal, House Leadership Offices.....	22,278	22,278	22,278	---	---
Members' Representational Allowances Including Members' Clerk Hire, Official Expenses of Members, and Official Mail					
Expenses.....	554,318	554,318	554,318	---	---
Committee Employees					
Standing Committees, Special and Select.....	123,903	123,903	123,903	---	---
Committee on Appropriations (including studies and investigations).....	23,271	23,271	23,271	---	---
Subtotal, Committee employees.....	147,174	147,174	147,174	---	---
Salaries, Officers and Employees					
Office of the Clerk.....	24,009	24,981	24,981	+972	---
Office of the Sergeant at Arms.....	11,927	14,827	14,827	+2,900	---
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.....	113,100	117,165	115,010	+1,910	-2,155
Office of the Inspector General.....	4,742	4,742	4,742	---	---
Office of General Counsel.....	1,341	1,413	1,413	+72	---
Office of the Parliamentarian.....	1,952	1,975	1,975	+23	---
Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House.....	4,088	3,120	3,120	-968	---
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House.....	8,893	8,353	8,353	-540	---
Office of Interparliamentary Affairs.....	814	814	814	---	---
Other authorized employees.....	479	479	479	---	---
Subtotal, Salaries, officers and employees.....	171,345	177,869	175,714	+4,369	-2,155
Allowances and Expenses					
Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims.....	4,153	3,625	3,625	-528	---
Official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House.....	190	190	190	---	---
Government contributions.....	256,636	252,164	254,448	-2,188	+2,284
Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery.....	16,217	16,289	16,217	---	-72
Transition activities.....	3,737	2,084	2,084	-1,653	---
Wounded Warrior program.....	2,500	2,500	2,500	---	---
Office of Congressional Ethics.....	1,467	1,524	1,467	---	-57
Miscellaneous items.....	720	720	720	---	---
Subtotal, Allowances and expenses.....	285,620	279,096	281,251	-4,369	+2,155
Total, House of Representatives (discretionary)...	1,180,735	1,180,735	1,180,735	---	---
Total, House of Representatives (mandatory).....	---	---	174	+174	+174



LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2250)  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
JOINT ITEMS					
Joint Economic Committee.....	4,203	4,254	4,203	---	-51
Joint Committee on Taxation.....	10,095	10,300	10,095	---	-205
Office of the Attending Physician					
Medical supplies, equipment, expenses, and allowances...	3,371	3,797	3,784	+413	-13
Office of Congressional Accessibility Services.....	1,387	1,416	1,387	---	-29
Total, Joint items.....	19,056	19,767	19,469	+413	-298
CAPITOL POLICE					
Salaries.....	286,500	307,428	300,000	+13,500	-7,428
General expenses.....	61,459	71,472	69,000	+7,541	-2,472
Total, Capitol Police.....	347,959	378,900	369,000	+21,041	-9,900
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,959	4,020	3,959	---	-61
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses.....	45,700	47,270	47,270	+1,570	---
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
Capitol Construction and Operations 1/.....	91,455	95,396	90,946	-509	-4,450
Capitol building.....	54,665	58,052	46,737	-7,928	-11,315
Capitol grounds.....	11,973	15,273	11,880	-93	-3,393
House of Representatives buildings:					
House office buildings.....	89,447	90,282	149,962	+60,515	+59,680
House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund..	70,000	70,000	10,000	-60,000	-60,000
Capitol Power Plant.....	99,652	129,803	100,550	+898	-29,253
Offsetting collections.....	-9,000	-9,000	-9,000	---	---
Subtotal, Capitol Power Plant.....	90,652	120,803	91,550	+898	-29,253
Library buildings and grounds.....	42,180	65,801	36,589	-5,591	-29,212
Capitol police buildings, grounds, and security.....	19,159	28,247	22,058	+2,899	-6,189
Botanic Garden.....	15,573	12,113	11,892	-3,681	-221
Capitol Visitor Center:					
CVC operations.....	20,844	21,043	20,557	-287	-486
Total, Architect of the Capitol.....	505,948	577,010	492,171	-13,777	-84,839
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS					
Salaries and expenses.....	419,357	444,370	419,357	---	-25,013
Authority to spend receipts.....	-6,350	-6,350	-6,350	---	---
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	413,007	438,020	413,007	---	-25,013
Copyright Office, Salaries and expenses.....	54,303	58,875	57,008	+2,705	-1,867
Authority to spend receipts.....	-33,582	-35,777	-35,777	-2,195	---
Subtotal, Copyright Office.....	20,721	23,098	21,231	+510	-1,867
Congressional Research Service, Salaries and expenses...	106,945	111,956	106,945	---	-5,011
Books for the blind and physically handicapped,					
Salaries and expenses.....	50,248	51,428	50,248	---	-1,180
Total, Library of Congress.....	590,921	624,502	591,431	+510	-33,071

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2250)  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE</b>					
Congressional publishing .....	79,736	79,736	79,736	---	---
Public Information Programs of the Superintendent of Documents.					
Salaries and expenses .....	31,500	30,500	30,500	-1,000	---
Government Publishing Office Business Operations Revolving Fund .....	8,757	9,764	---	-8,757	-9,764
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, Government Publishing Office .....	119,993	120,000	110,236	-9,757	-9,764
<b>GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	545,750	578,508	547,450	+1,700	-31,058
Offsetting collections.....	-23,750	-25,450	-25,450	-1,700	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, Government Accountability Office.....	522,000	553,058	522,000	---	-31,058
<b>OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER TRUST FUND</b>					
Payment to the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund.....	5,700	8,000	5,700	---	-2,300
<b>JOHN C. STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT</b>					
Stennis Center for Public Service.....	430	430	430	---	---
<b>GENERAL PROVISIONS</b>					
Scorekeeping adjustment (CBO estimate).....	-1,000	---	-1,000	---	-1,000
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Grand total.....	3,341,401	3,513,692	3,341,575	+174	-172,117
Discretionary.....	(3,341,401)	(3,513,692)	(3,341,401)	---	(-172,291)
Mandatory.....	---	---	(174)	(+174)	(+174)
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

1/ Formerly named General Administration

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2250)  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
RECAPITULATION					
House of Representatives (discretionary).....	1,180,735	1,180,735	1,180,735	---	---
House of Representatives (mandatory).....	---	---	174	+174	+174
Joint Items.....	19,056	19,767	19,469	+413	-298
Capitol Police.....	347,959	378,900	369,000	+21,041	-9,900
Office of Compliance.....	3,959	4,020	3,959	---	-61
Congressional Budget Office.....	45,700	47,270	47,270	+1,570	---
Architect of the Capitol.....	505,948	577,010	492,171	-13,777	-84,839
Library of Congress.....	590,921	624,502	591,431	+510	-33,071
Government Publishing Office.....	119,993	120,000	110,236	-9,757	-9,764
Government Accountability Office.....	522,000	553,058	522,000	---	-31,058
Open World Leadership Center.....	5,700	8,000	5,700	---	-2,300
Stennis Center for Public Service.....	430	430	430	---	---
General Provisions.....	-1,000	---	-1,000	---	-1,000
Grand total.....	3,341,401	3,513,692	3,341,575	+174	-172,117
Discretionary.....	(3,341,401)	(3,513,692)	(3,341,401)	---	(-172,291)
Mandatory.....	---	---	(174)	(+174)	(+174)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by congratulating Chairman GRAVES on his maiden voyage as a chair of an appropriations subcommittee. I know that he was diligent and focused, and we found agreement where we could, and where we could not agree, I appreciate his willingness to discuss it in a congenial and thoughtful manner.

Today, we consider the smallest of the appropriations bills; and, while that is the case, it is one that does fund an entire branch of our government. The bill provides, as the chairman mentioned, \$3.3 billion to the legislative branch, without Senate items, and is equal to the amount provided in fiscal year 2015.

Unfortunately, this represents the third year in a row of flat funding for the overall legislative branch. Certain agencies—the Architect of the Capitol and the Government Publishing Office—are cut below fiscal year 2015 to support increases in other agencies.

I know if there was overall relief in the budget allocation, we would see more investment in the staff and facilities in the legislative branch, but we are starting to cut into bone in some places, and it is truly unwise.

It is regrettable that this bill is, as are all of the other appropriations bills, bound by spending limits set by the Republican budget resolution that continues sequestration.

The President put forward a plan that will avoid sequestration's harmful budget cuts and reduce the deficit in a balanced way. Unfortunately, the Republican budget does not at least meet the President's plan halfway.

As we look to conference with the Senate later in the year on appropriations bills, I am hopeful that both parties and the President can come together for another reasonable bargain that gives us more room for discretionary programs.

This bill is being considered under a structured rule, as is tradition. Twenty amendments were filed, seven of which were filed by Democratic Members. Regrettably, the Rules Committee only made three Republican amendments in order, all of which would further erode the Legislative Branch bill's funding.

No Democratic amendments were made in order, even though several were aimed at improving the lives of our restaurant workers whose plight was played out in very public display in the last several weeks.

Last night, in the Rules Committee, I asked the committee to attempt to find some parity, Mr. Chairman, between the majority and minority with regard to amendments made in order; instead of parity, the minority was completely shut out of the process.

As a result of the allocation, several infrastructure projects with life and safety elements are not funded in this bill, even though we have been committed to funding those in past years.

Cutting necessary upgrades to our elevators will not get us out of debt; what it will do is get people stuck in our elevators. We should not be surprised if an accident happens because we didn't address important life-safety projects.

This bill, as I have said many times before, is not the sexiest of the 13 appropriations bills, but it is one that is incredibly important, and it is important that we keep the people who visit the Capitol and work in the Capitol safe, and this bill makes it less likely that we will be able to do that.

There are not many new initiatives in the bill, given the allocation, but I am pleased that the bill recognized the importance of the Nation's copyright laws by providing some of the requested increase.

The Copyright Office must improve the backlog of registrations, as well as their business processes. Currently, customers can only submit documents on paper, which the Copyright Office turns into a digital format, which is a glaring inefficiency. It is 2015, the 21st century. Our Copyright Office should not be conducting 21st century business in a 20th century format.

The Copyright Office said it best itself in a report released in February of this year:

There is a widespread perception that our licensing system is broken. Songwriters and recording artists are concerned that they cannot make a living under the existing structure, which raises serious and systemic concerns for the future. Music publishers and performance rights organizations are frustrated that so much of their licensing activity is subject to government control, so they are constrained in the marketplace. Record labels and digital services complain that the licensing process is burdensome and inefficient, making it difficult to innovate.

I am glad to see that this bill is beginning to address necessary upgrades.

Mr. Chairman, I am also concerned with the cut to the Government Publishing Office in the underlying bill. This office was formerly known as the Government Printing Office. Congress changed the name in December to reflect what the agency actually does in this digital world. The office publishes information online and plays a vital role in Congress' transparency.

Unfortunately, GPO's request to continue to improve its online site, as it has been allowed to do each year before this one, even under full sequestration, was denied in the bill. The cut to GPO's online site continues to raise the concern from some that GPO could ultimately decide to charge the public for access to legislative documents, as was recommended to them by the National Academy of Public Administration in 2013.

I agree with Representatives CANDICE MILLER and BOB BRADY, the chair and ranking member of House Administration, who wrote to GPO, stating: "Charging the public to access legislative data and documents would be a colossal setback to the progress Congress has made to improve transparency and access to legislative information."

They also said charging the public "would be a direct assault on our ability to engage Americans in a process that is of great consequence to their livelihoods."

GPO indicated at the time of the Miller-Brady letter that it had no plans to charge users for what should be public information; but what choice are we leaving them if we don't continue investing in their online systems?

Also included in the bill is a requirement that the Architect seek approval, as the chairman described, from the House Committee on Appropriations and the Government Accountability Office for any project or phase of a project over \$5 million.

I support strong oversight, as I have demonstrated many times over the last 8 years, but I do question whether or not the low threshold would unnecessarily hold up the progress of essential projects.

We should require the assistance of GAO to review projects on the scale of the Cannon building restoration. I have asked GAO to come in and get involved very specifically in a number of things where accountability was a concern, but I question the use of GAO's resources on projects as small as \$5 million. That begins to micromanage beyond what is reasonable.

To end on a more positive note, I am pleased that we were able to provide \$10 million to add to the House historic buildings revitalization trust fund. We have been banking funds for our large projects over the last several years, which is imperative to help ensure we avoid getting caught flatfooted if we experience unexpected costs in the future.

As I conclude, I want to, again, thank Chairman GRAVES for an open dialogue as he crafted this bill. I did have a lot of opportunity to talk with him about the details of this bill and offer suggestions, many of which he took. Again, I look forward to continuing to work with the chairman as the bill moves to the Senate and then on to conference.

I particularly want to thank our incredible staff, one of whom is sitting next to me, Shalanda Young, and the rest of our staff, Liz Dawson, Chuck Turner, on the majority side; and Jenny Panone, as well as Jason Murphy, with Chairman GRAVES' personal office; and Rosalyn Kumar, on my personal staff. Thank you so much.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to our full committee chairman, I do want to thank the ranking member for her work on this, her input. She worked diligently through the process and was supportive in subcommittee and full committee, and I wanted to thank her for that publicly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Chairman GRAVES, thank you for yielding the

time, and thank you for the great work.

This is the first bill that Chairman GRAVES has brought to the floor of the House. He is the newest cardinal that we have, one of the 12 subcommittee chairmen—they are called cardinals—and this is his first bill.

I want to congratulate him and Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for putting together what I think is a pretty high standard for fiscal responsibility for the House, freezing funding at last year's level, \$3.3 billion.

That is the third year in a row, Mr. Chairman, that we have frozen the budget of the House of Representatives, making good on our promise to rein in spending and do more with less.

□ 1530

This level maintains the 14 percent reduction in House funding that began when Republicans took control of the House 4 years ago.

In addition, we have continued the freeze on Member pay that has been in place since 2010. We believe that in order for us to ask others to sacrifice throughout the government, that we have to sacrifice, ourselves, first; and that is what this bill does.

The bill includes numerous provisions designed to guarantee that the House and its support agencies are spending their tax dollars appropriately and to keep them accountable to the taxpayers. This includes enhancing oversight of the Cannon building restoration project and making sure that Congress approves any large-scale construction project.

These steps will help ensure that this type of major undertaking stays on time and on budget and are especially important given the historical significance of our buildings and the importance of their use.

The \$3.3 billion this bill provides for the House is directed to support the most important functions of our legislative branch: keeping our Member and committee offices open for business, protecting the safety of those who work in and visit the Capitol complex, and improving the way we support our agencies—and the importance of doing just that.

For instance, the Capitol Police budget has been increased by \$21 million to ensure our men in blue have the resources needed to protect this hallowed building and its grounds. And where we have seen issues in the agencies funded by the bill—for example, IT infrastructure challenges at the Library of Congress—we have taken the steps to make sure that these will be fixed moving forward.

Again, I want to thank Chairman GRAVES, Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and this great staff that has worked hard on this bill. They have demonstrated their love of this institution and these grounds by the hard work and devotion they have put into making this bill possible. So we want to thank the staff on both sides of the

aisle for putting together this small but mighty bill. So I thank them for all of their work.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud that the House can lead by example when it comes to restoring fiscal discipline to the operations of the Federal Government. This bill will allow the House to fulfill its core duties within a responsible, realistic budget and preserve the democracy that makes this Nation so great.

I thank the chairman for the time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee as well as the ranking member of the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Subcommittee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GRAVES and Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for their hard work on this bill.

Today, during what the majority has labeled "Innovation Week," we consider the smallest of the appropriation bills, which funds the operations of our Nation's legislative branch.

Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely nothing innovative about this bill. Without Senate items, the bill is \$3.341 billion. Despite years of "tightening our belts," the majority has, yet again, kept funding flat and further damaged this institution's reputation and ability to function at the highest level.

Member representational allowances, or MRAs, would be frozen for a third consecutive year and will continue to strain the House's ability to serve the American people due to fewer staff for constituent casework, the inability to effectively communicate with our constituents, and fewer district offices.

Furthermore, we will consider amendments to the bill which would compound the problems legislative branch agencies face: our buildings are crumbling, life and safety projects are postponed, and agencies have hit the limits of what they can do with inadequate funding. Further cuts proposed today will have even greater implications for the operations of the Congress.

I am concerned that the majority continues funding for a partisan lawsuit against the President. At a time when we are putting appropriation bills under tight budgetary restrictions, this waste of taxpayer dollars only distracts us from the serious work Congress should get done.

Notwithstanding my misgivings, I want to again congratulate the chairman for putting forth his first bill and working with the ranking member, where possible. We need more cooperation between the majority and the minority.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise on this bill, as a member of the subcommittee, with very mixed emotions. There are some very good things in this bill, but there is also some bad stuff. The question is whether the bill is 51 percent good or 51 percent bad.

I came to Congress because I believe that government can play a positive role in American lives. Government is not the enemy.

But it makes me wonder then why this body refuses to invest in the tools to do the job of government and, by extension, to do the job of the American people. This bill contains the same funding levels it did last year, and that is \$172 million less than the budget request.

Any good corporation plots its investments so the company can prosper. In terms of the House of Representatives, that would mean setting spending at a level that would maximize its ability to serve the people. By failing to make those investments, we disrespect the American people, and we tell them that we are not worth the investment, not worth the effort, not worth doing the job well.

This bill fails to invest in the very institution we depend upon to make government function properly. This body is being given short shrift.

I am on the Appropriations Committee. I think it is our responsibility to meet the needs of the Nation in every respect, and that includes investing in the legislative branch of government so it can do its job.

Those low polling numbers that Congress gets—everybody here talks about how low it is—I think they are the self-fulfilled policy of a Congress that refuses to provide itself the tools they need to serve the public.

Skimping isn't going to make this place work any better. Using taxpayer dollars more wisely will.

Having said that, I am also supportive of what the committee brought to the floor in a program called the Open World Leadership Center. It is operated out of funds from Congress with the Library of Congress.

What Members may not know is that this program was begun as the brainchild of the late Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska and the Librarian of Congress. It was to expose young and emerging leaders—average age about 38—in Russia and former Eastern bloc countries. Some of those countries include Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova, Kazakhstan.

I think President Putin would love to see this program go away, the way USAID has left the region.

It makes a difference to those young leaders to visit congressional districts, to see how city councils work, to see how school boards work, to see the United States, the State legislators, the judges. The program belongs in the legislative branch because peer-to-peer relationships do work.

The program reaches out to all 50 States. More than 23,000 rising leaders have been hosted by the United States Government since the program's inception. Eighty percent of those have met with Members of Congress and visited their congressional districts. This is a very robust exchange program.

I had a group in my district out in the central coast of California, and one of the visitors had been a member of the Duma, their Congress. He told me that he had been invited by our country to be here at least about a dozen times. But only in visiting the communities and seeing the local government in action did he actually understand what democracy was all about, a bottom's-up process in America that is never learned just visiting Washington or getting taught in a classroom. The value of hands-on, from-the-ground-up democracy is a lesson that can't be learned from a book. Open World experiences show these participants that democracy is not just a dream. It is actually a working reality, one that they can have in their home countries if they work at it. And America shows them how.

There is an amendment coming up, the Ratcliffe amendment, and I hope that all the Members of Congress will reject that amendment to delete this program.

Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate the work of the gentleman from Georgia, our new chairman. He has done a great job. I hope that we will spend, though, a little bit more money investing in this institution so that we can get the job done, not just talk about how we can cut, squeeze, and trim, sacrificing the ability of Congress to be its best.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR). He is a great member of the subcommittee and a strong advocate for a lot of elements within our budget. The truth is, we had tough choices to make. It wasn't easy. We are held within the constraints of what current law is.

The President may have submitted a budget that didn't comply with the constraints that we have to comply with, but that doesn't mean that we can adhere to his budget numbers. So we are \$170-something million below what the President requested or what the budget request was, but we are within the limits that are provided by law that many of the Members within this body voted for—excluding myself—and the President signed it into law.

At some point, we have to grapple with that, as a House, and understand that is the law. And until that law is changed, tough choices we will have to make.

As the chairman of the full committee so eloquently stated earlier, it is up to us to lead by example, and that is who we have elected to be our leaders and to represent our districts by example. So these are tough choices, no doubt. I agree with the gentleman from California.

I know we had a goal, as a committee, and it was really bipartisan, our objective; and that was to honor and respect taxpayers today and preserve the institution for future generations, given the limited resources we had to work with.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, let me just point out that the chairman is right: we do have to lead by example.

Leading by example, as we have in the past, like last fiscal year—after the President submitted his budget, we certainly could have and should have, as a Congress, sat down with the President and negotiated an adjustment to the sequester, which we were able to successfully do last year, and that was to the betterment of making sure that people who are simply trying to succeed have the opportunity to do so in this country instead of living under the severe cuts and caps that sequestration forced us into. That is Congress' job, which we abdicated. That was not the choice of the minority; it was the choice of the majority.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I appreciate my colleague from Florida yielding, and I appreciate the work that she and colleagues on both sides of the aisle have done on this bill. I want to commend them for their work.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to address an amendment yet to come, one that I hope this body will reject. This is an amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE). It will be an amendment to undo the bipartisan work of our Appropriations Committee. It would terminate the Open World program at the Library of Congress, which is a major outreach effort of our legislative branch in Russia and former Soviet and Soviet bloc countries.

At a time when these countries' democracies and sovereignty are under threat, the Open World program, I believe, is more important than ever. This isn't President Putin's favorite activity, as others have stated. That puts it very mildly, believe me. But he has not been able to stop it.

It is now more important than ever, not just in Russia but in fragile democracies and would-be democracies, such as Ukraine, Moldova, Kyrgyzstan, and Georgia.

This is the best program of its kind that I have ever seen. And I have a lot of personal experience with Open World groups that have come to Washington and have come to my district.

This is a program unique in both scope and concept. Most participants aren't the people who typically participate in international exchange pro-

grams. They are teachers, judges, local officials, young activists, people who live in rural areas and small towns. This program penetrates deeply, rather than just being another run-of-the-mill exchange program.

□ 1545

I invite any colleague to talk to any of our diplomats in the participant countries. You will leave with no doubt about how unique and how valuable the network of Open World participants is in the struggle for democracy in those countries and for the way our country is regarded, and there is a long list of veterans of Open World who are now public and private sector leaders in their countries.

Mr. Chairman, some may question the placement of Open World in the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill. In fact, I think that is a huge asset. Because the program is not tied to a specific administration with its goals and politics, there is no hurdle to participation. There is no possibility that it will get lost as the State Department focuses on our other regions or on other priorities.

Now, unlike the other programs in this bill, sure enough, Open World is not about us. It is not about our salaries. It is not about our staffs. It is not about our operations. It is not about us. But I assure you, it is about our country. It is about what we stand for at home and around the world. It is about projecting the value of our democratic principles to countries with histories of oppressive rule.

The Appropriations Committee included funding for Open World following a bipartisan effort led by Representatives FORTENBERRY and FARR. Hopefully, today that wise decision will be sustained.

I strongly encourage this body to stand with the pro-democracy advocates, many, many brave and courageous people in a critical part of the world. Oppose the Ratcliffe amendment.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Point of clarification because I know these proceedings are documented well, and I know the ranking member stated that sequestration was a decision of the majority and not the minority. In some aspects, she is very correct, because at the time sequestration was implemented, the majority of the Senate was held by Democrats, and the concept came from Jack Lew, which is heavily documented, from the President's administration. So just to make sure there is full clarity here of majority and minority perspectives, there was a different majority at the time when that was taking place.

If I could, just for a moment, address the Open World discussion here. This is a program that has been ongoing for several years—it has been decades, quite frankly—with great intentions in the beginning. What hasn't been stated

today is that its intention was to be a one-time program to assist during a transitional phase of the Soviet bloc countries at that time, back in the Bill Clinton administration, to assist them with some dialogue with free markets and diplomacy and such as we were experiencing during that time.

As we know, with a lot of government programs that have good intentions of being one time, singular, they tend to go on into perpetuity. Yet we have heard claims today that there is not enough money, that we don't have enough to spend on things that are so vital and so critical to this body, to the institution, to meeting our constituents' needs, to the \$1.5 billion in deferred maintenance of buildings, to MRAs not being enough, or whatever it might be. Yet there is still this clinging to \$5 million of training Russian diplomats or Russian civic leaders is more important, more important than meeting the critical needs that we have here as a body, whether it is the Library of Congress, whether it is making sure that there is security provided through the Capitol Police, that they are fully funded where they need to be, whatever it might be.

I would claim, Mr. Chairman, that today, if we cannot cut \$5 million from a program that is duplicative, that there are 95 other programs that do very similar things, a program that has not been transparent, a program that has outlived its day, that is training Russians at a time when Russia is causing aggression against our allies and it is assisting our enemies, if we can't cut \$5 million today and the gentleman from Texas' amendment fails today, God help us, when can we cut something from this budget?

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

While I intend to claim time in opposition to the amendment that addresses Open World a little bit later, which I know will come as a surprise to the chairman, I do want to point out now that what the chairman says is not quite accurate, which is why I am going to oppose the amendment. Because we were—and there were a number of options available to the Rules Committee—taking the \$5 million that is going to Open World in the Legislative Branch bill now and putting it in to some other place in the Legislative Branch bill, life safety programs, restoring the cuts to GPO, or doing something that is going to make sure that the legislative branch can be competitive and has the ability to get our work done, then that would have been fine, because I agree that Open World is actually a square peg in a round hole and shouldn't be funded out of this bill, and I have made that case for many years.

Instead, what the majority did is they took an amendment that takes that \$5 million and puts it into the

spending reduction account. We are already \$106 million below 2010 levels in our MRA, in our office accounts. This bill is flat-funded for 3 years in a row. We are doing ourselves a disservice and making it difficult for us to do our jobs when we had a ripe opportunity to take that \$5 million—which I would have been for—and put it somewhere in the Legislative Branch bill instead of sending it out of here. That is not responsible.

Additionally, I will point out that perhaps the chairman's comments about sequestration demonstrate that he thinks that Congress' hands are tied and that we don't have the ability to actually make changes. The President has proposed what he believes we should do as an alternative to the sequester. That was his proposed budget.

Like last year, we also have the ability to set aside and work with the administration—set aside at least part of the sequester—so we could provide improved allocations for each of these appropriations bills and make sure that we can make life better for more Americans. Unfortunately, the majority continues to act as if somehow we are frozen in time and that we are paralyzed by sequestration as the law. The last time I checked, the Founding Fathers in the Constitution gave Congress the ability to change the law, which we should do.

Mr. Chairman, I will look forward to discussing some of the amendments that we will be debating in a few moments.

Again, I want to thank the chairman for, really, the opportunity to spend some time focusing on the needs of the legislative branch and giving us the ability to at least move forward in some ways towards addressing our role as a coequal branch of government. I think this bill could have been far better. It has made several positive changes, but as I have outlined, we have places where we disagree, but we did it without being disagreeable.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the ranking member, and I appreciate her acknowledgment of her opposition to the amendment that will arrive earlier. I would point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that I am not a member of the Rules Committee. I did not make that decision as to what amendment would be adopted or not. There were three amendments very similar. They were bipartisan. So there was bipartisan opposition to this program. We have the amendment before us that is before us, and, for the record, I will be supporting that amendment.

Let me say this has been a process that has been difficult. I understand that. We have had some tough choices to make, but we have made them. We made them in a bipartisan way in which we had unanimous support out of subcommittee; we had no opposition

that I recall in full committee. And so I expect today that we might maintain some of that bipartisanship, some of that ability to get something done here for the American people and show them that we have priorities in place that honor and respect them and preserve this institution for future generations.

Mr. Chairman, to sum up what this bill does is we are here to hold the line on spending. We are keeping it flat-funded, as we have for the last year or two. This is a bill that is going to honor and respect our taxpayers. It is one that is preserving the beauty of this Capitol campus, providing a central security for all visitors and staff, and ensuring that we are able to provide the services that our constituents expect and deserve.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2250

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, namely:

#### TITLE I—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

##### PAYMENT TO WIDOWS AND HEIRS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

For payment to Tori B. Nunnelee, widow of Alan Nunnelee, late a Representative from the State of Mississippi, \$174,000.

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, \$1,180,736,000, as follows:

##### HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, \$22,278,891, including: Office of the Speaker, \$6,645,417, including \$25,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, \$2,180,048, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, \$7,114,471, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Majority Whip, \$1,886,632, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip; Office of the Minority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Minority Whip, \$1,459,639, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip; Republican Conference, \$1,505,426; Democratic Caucus, \$1,487,258: *Provided*, That such amount for salaries and expenses shall remain available from January 3, 2016 until January 2, 2017.

##### MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES INCLUDING MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE, OFFICIAL EXPENSES OF MEMBERS, AND OFFICIAL MAIL

For Members' representational allowances, including Members' clerk hire, official expenses, and official mail, \$554,317,732.

##### COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

##### STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by House resolutions, \$123,903,173: *Provided*, That



such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2016.

#### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the Committee on Appropriations, \$23,271,004, including studies and examinations of executive agencies and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed: *Provided*, That such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2016.

#### SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law, \$175,713,679, including: for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Clerk, including the positions of the Chaplain and the Historian, and including not more than \$25,000, of which not more than \$20,000 is for the Family Room and not more than \$2,000 is for the Office of the Chaplain, for official representation and reception expenses, \$24,980,898; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including the position of Superintendent of Garages and the Office of Emergency Management, and including not more than \$3,000 for official representation and reception expenses, \$14,827,120 of which \$4,784,229 shall remain available until expended; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer including not more than \$3,000 for official representation and reception expenses, \$115,010,000, of which \$1,350,000 shall remain available until expended; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, \$4,741,809; for salaries and expenses of the Office of General Counsel, \$1,413,450; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian, \$2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, and not more than \$1,000 for official representation and reception expenses, \$1,974,606; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, \$3,119,766; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, \$8,352,975; for salaries and expenses of the Office of Interparliamentary Affairs, \$814,069; for other authorized employees, \$478,986.

#### ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, \$281,251,521, including: supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, \$3,625,236; official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House, \$190,486; Government contributions for health, retirement, Social Security, and other applicable employee benefits, \$254,447,514, to remain available until March 31, 2017; Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery, \$16,217,008 of which \$5,000,000 shall remain available until expended; transition activities for new members and staff, \$2,084,000, to remain available until expended; Wounded Warrior Program \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended; Office of Congressional Ethics, \$1,467,030; and miscellaneous items including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of House motor vehicles, interparliamentary receptions, and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, \$720,247.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. (a) **REQUIRING AMOUNTS REMAINING IN MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES TO BE USED FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION OR TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEBT.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any amounts appropriated under this Act for “HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—SALA-

RIES AND EXPENSES—MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES” shall be available only for fiscal year 2016. Any amount remaining after all payments are made under such allowances for fiscal year 2016 shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction (or, if there is no Federal budget deficit after all such payments have been made, for reducing the Federal debt, in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate).

(b) **REGULATIONS.**—The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives shall have authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—As used in this section, the term “Member of the House of Representatives” means a Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

#### DELIVERY OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

SEC. 102. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of a bill, joint resolution, or resolution to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) unless the Member requests a copy.

#### DELIVERY OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SEC. 103. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of any version of the Congressional Record to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress).

#### LIMITATION ON AMOUNT AVAILABLE TO LEASE VEHICLES

SEC. 104. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives to make any payments from any Members' Representational Allowance for the leasing of a vehicle, excluding mobile district offices, in an aggregate amount that exceeds \$1,000 for the vehicle in any month.

#### LIMITATION ON PRINTED COPIES OF U.S. CODE TO HOUSE

SEC. 105. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide an aggregate number of more than 50 printed copies of any edition of the United States Code to all offices of the House of Representatives.

#### DELIVERY OF REPORTS OF DISBURSEMENTS

SEC. 106. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of the report of disbursements for the operations of the House of Representatives under section 106 of the House of Representatives Administrative Reform Technical Corrections Act (2 U.S.C. 5535) to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress).

#### DELIVERY OF DAILY CALENDAR

SEC. 107. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) a printed copy of the Daily Calendar of the House of Representatives which is prepared by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

#### JOINT ITEMS

For Joint Committees, as follows:

##### JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, \$4,203,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

##### JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, \$10,095,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

For other joint items, as follows:

##### OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including:

(1) an allowance of \$2,175 per month to the Attending Physician;

(2) an allowance of \$1,300 per month to the Senior Medical Officer;

(3) an allowance of \$725 per month each to three medical officers while on duty in the Office of the Attending Physician;

(4) an allowance of \$725 per month to 2 assistants and \$580 per month each not to exceed 11 assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistants; and

(5) \$2,692,000 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, \$3,784,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

##### OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ACCESSIBILITY SERVICES

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services, \$1,387,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

##### CAPITOL POLICE

##### SALARIES

For salaries of employees of the Capitol Police, including overtime, hazardous duty pay, and Government contributions for health, retirement, social security, professional liability insurance, and other applicable employee benefits, \$300,000,000 of which overtime shall not exceed \$30,928,000 unless the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate are notified, to be disbursed by the Chief of the Capitol Police or his designee.

##### GENERAL EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, security equipment and installation, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, forensic services, stenographic services, personal and professional services, the employee assistance program, the awards program, postage, communication services, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and not more than \$5,000 to be expended on the certification of the Chief of the Capitol Police in connection with official representation and reception expenses, \$69,000,000, to be disbursed by the Chief of the Capitol Police or his designee: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 2016 shall be paid by the Secretary of Homeland Security from funds available to the Department of Homeland Security.

##### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

##### DEPOSIT OF REIMBURSEMENTS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 1001. (a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2802(a)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1905(a)(1)) is amended by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting the following: “District of Columbia”, and from any other source in the case of assistance provided in connection with an

activity that was not sponsored by Congress”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2802(a)(2) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1905(a)(2)) is amended by striking “law enforcement assistance to any Federal, State, or local government agency (including any agency of the District of Columbia)” and inserting “any law enforcement assistance for which reimbursement described in paragraph (1) is made”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to any reimbursement received before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, as authorized by section 305 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1385), \$3,959,000, of which \$450,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That not more than \$500 may be expended on the certification of the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance in connection with official representation and reception expenses.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary for operation of the Congressional Budget Office, including not more than \$6,000 to be expended on the certification of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, \$47,270,000.

#### ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

##### CAPITOL CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATIONS

For salaries for the Architect of the Capitol, and other personal services, at rates of pay provided by law; for all necessary expenses for surveys and studies, construction, operation, and general and administrative support in connection with facilities and activities under the care of the Architect of the Capitol including the Botanic Garden; electrical substations of the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol; including furnishings and office equipment; including not more than \$5,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; for purchase or exchange, maintenance, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle, \$90,946,000.

##### CAPITOL BUILDING

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol, \$46,737,000, of which \$22,737,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020.

##### CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, \$11,880,000, of which \$2,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020.

##### HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House office buildings, \$149,962,000, of which \$23,886,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020, and of which \$62,000,000 shall remain available until expended for the restoration and renovation of the Cannon House Office Building.

In addition, for a payment to the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

##### CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol

Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office, and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, the Union Station complex, the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, \$91,549,898, of which \$14,408,898 shall remain available until September 30, 2020: *Provided*, That not more than \$9,000,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 2016.

##### LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, \$36,589,000, of which \$11,646,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020.

##### CAPITOL POLICE BUILDINGS, GROUNDS AND SECURITY

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of buildings, grounds and security enhancements of the United States Capitol Police, wherever located, the Alternate Computer Facility, and AOC security operations, \$22,058,000, of which \$4,525,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020.

##### BOTANIC GARDEN

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, \$11,892,000; of which \$2,100,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020: *Provided*, That of the amount made available under this heading, the Architect of the Capitol may obligate and expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance, care and operation of the National Garden established under section 307E of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (2 U.S.C. 2146), upon vouchers approved by the Architect of the Capitol or a duly authorized designee.

##### CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

For all necessary expenses for the operation of the Capitol Visitor Center, \$20,557,000.

##### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

##### NO BONUSES FOR CONTRACTORS BEHIND SCHEDULE OR OVER BUDGET

SEC. 1101. None of the funds made available in this Act for the Architect of the Capitol may be used to make incentive or award payments to contractors for work on contracts or programs for which the contractor is behind schedule or over budget, unless the Architect of the Capitol, or agency-employed designee, determines that any such deviations are due to unforeseeable events, government-driven scope changes, or are not significant within the overall scope of the project and/or program.

##### SCRIMS

SEC. 1102. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for scrims containing photographs of building facades during restoration or construction projects performed by the Architect of the Capitol.

##### ACQUISITION OF PARCEL AT FORT MEADE

SEC. 1103. (a) ACQUISITION.—The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to acquire from the Maryland State Highway Administration, at no cost to the United States, a parcel of real property (including improvements thereon) consisting of approximately 7.34 acres located within the portion of Fort George G. Meade in Anne Arundel County, Maryland, that was transferred to the Architect of the Capitol by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to section 122 of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1994 (2 U.S.C. 141 note).

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The terms and conditions applicable under subsections (b) and (d) of section 122 of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1994 (2 U.S.C. 141 note) to the property acquired by the Architect of the Capitol pursuant to such section shall apply to the real property acquired by the Architect pursuant to the authority of this section.

##### OVERSIGHT PLAN FOR FUNDS PROVIDED FOR LARGE SCALE PROJECTS

SEC. 1104. (a) The Architect of the Capitol may not obligate more than 25 percent of the amount made available to the Architect under this Act for any project for which \$5,000,000 or more is appropriated under this Act until—

(1) the Architect submits to the Comptroller General and the Committee on Appropriations of House of Representatives a plan for the use of the funds provided for the project which includes a description of any changes to the project's schedule (including benchmarks for the timing of the completion of various stages of the project) or the project's costs (including estimates of the total costs of the project or the total life cycle costs of the project), as well as a description of the accounting and other safeguards the Architect will implement to ensure that the project will be carried out in a timely and cost-effective manner; and

(2) the Comptroller General and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives approves such plan.

##### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Library's catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; operation and maintenance of the American Folklife Center in the Library; preparation and distribution of catalog records and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, \$419,357,000, of which not more than \$6,000,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2016, and shall remain available until expended, under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150) and not more than \$350,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2016 and shall remain available until expended for the development and maintenance of an international legal information database and activities related thereto: *Provided*, That the Library of Congress may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under the Act of June 28, 1902, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than

\$6,350,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not more than \$12,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Overseas Field Offices: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, \$8,231,000 shall remain available until expended for the digital collections and educational curricula program.

#### COPYRIGHT OFFICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, \$57,008,000, of which not more than \$30,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2016 under section 708(d) of title 17, United States Code: *Provided*, That the Copyright Office may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under such section, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That not more than \$5,777,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2016 under sections 111(d)(2), 119(b)(3), 803(e), 1005, and 1316 of such title: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than \$35,777,000: *Provided further*, That not more than \$100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an "International Copyright Institute" in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: *Provided further*, That not more than \$6,500 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute and for copyright delegations, visitors, and seminars: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any provision of chapter 8 of title 17, United States Code, any amounts made available under this heading which are attributable to royalty fees and payments received by the Copyright Office pursuant to sections 111, 119, and chapter 10 of such title may be used for the costs incurred in the administration of the Copyright Royalty Judges program, with the exception of the costs of salaries and benefits for the Copyright Royalty Judges and staff under section 802(e).

#### CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, \$106,945,000: *Provided*, That no part of such amount may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Administration or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

#### BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 46 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), \$50,248,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, not more than \$650,000 shall be available to contract to provide newspapers to blind and physically handicapped residents at no cost to the individual.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION REIMBURSABLE AND REVOLVING FUND ACTIVITIES

SEC. 1201. (a) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2016, the obligational authority of the Library of Congress for the activities described in subsection (b) may not exceed \$186,015,000.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—The activities referred to in subsection (a) are reimbursable and revolving fund activities that are funded from sources other than appropriations to the Library in appropriations Acts for the legislative branch.

#### GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

##### CONGRESSIONAL PUBLISHING

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For authorized publishing of congressional information and the distribution of congressional information in any format; expenses necessary for preparing the semimonthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (section 902 of title 44, United States Code); publishing of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress; and publishing, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, \$79,736,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for paper copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under section 906 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the 2-year limitation under section 718 of title 44, United States Code, none of the funds appropriated or made available under this Act or any other Act for printing and binding and related services provided to Congress under chapter 7 of title 44, United States Code, may be expended to print a document, report, or publication after the 27-month period beginning on the date that such document, report, or publication is authorized by Congress to be printed, unless Congress reauthorizes such printing in accordance with section 718 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Publishing Office business operations revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding sections 901, 902, and 906 of title 44, United States Code, this appropriation may be used to prepare indexes to the Congressional Record on only a monthly and session basis.

#### PUBLIC INFORMATION PROGRAMS OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses of the public information programs of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their distribution to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, \$30,500,000: *Provided*, That amounts of not more than \$2,000,000 from current year appropriations are authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional serial sets and other related publications for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 to depository and other designated libraries: *Provided*

*further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Publishing Office business operations revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

#### GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE BUSINESS OPERATIONS REVOLVING FUND

The Government Publishing Office is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the Government Publishing Office business operations revolving fund: *Provided*, That not more than \$7,500 may be expended on the certification of the Director of the Government Publishing Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further*, That the business operations revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of not more than 12 passenger motor vehicles: *Provided further*, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Director of the Government Publishing Office shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the business operations revolving fund shall be available for temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title: *Provided further*, That activities financed through the business operations revolving fund may provide information in any format: *Provided further*, That the business operations revolving fund and the funds provided under the heading "Public Information Programs of the Superintendent of Documents" may not be used for contracted security services at GPO's passport facility in the District of Columbia.

#### GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Government Accountability Office, including not more than \$12,500 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title; hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries in accordance with section 3324 of title 31, United States Code; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), (6), and (8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), (6), and (8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries, \$522,000,000: *Provided*, That, in addition, \$25,450,000 of payments received under sections 782, 791, 3521, and 9105 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental

Audit Forum shall be available to finance an appropriate share of either Forum's costs as determined by the respective Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants: *Provided further*, That payments hereunder to the Forum may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DETAILS

SEC. 1301. (a) PERMITTING DETAILS FROM OTHER FEDERAL OFFICES.—Section 731 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DETAILS.—The activities of the Government Accountability Office may, in the reasonable discretion of the Comptroller General, be carried out by receiving details of personnel from other offices of the Federal Government on a reimbursable, partially-reimbursable, or nonreimbursable basis.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each succeeding fiscal year.

#### OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER TRUST FUND

For a payment to the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund for financing activities of the Open World Leadership Center under section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1151), \$5,700,000, except that any funds made available under this heading to support Russian participants shall only be used for those engaging in free market development, humanitarian activities, and civic engagement, and shall not be used for officials of the central government of Russia.

#### JOHN C. STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

For payment to the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund established under section 116 of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development Act (2 U.S.C. 1105), \$430,000.

#### TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### MAINTENANCE AND CARE OF PRIVATE VEHICLES

SEC. 201. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles, except for emergency assistance and cleaning as may be provided under regulations relating to parking facilities for the House of Representatives issued by the Committee on House Administration and for the Senate issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

##### FISCAL YEAR LIMITATION

SEC. 202. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond fiscal year 2016 unless expressly so provided in this Act.

##### RATES OF COMPENSATION AND DESIGNATION

SEC. 203. Whenever in this Act any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 (46 Stat. 32 et seq.) is appropriated for or the rate of compensation or designation of any office or position appropriated for is different from that specifically established by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation in this Act shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided*, That the provisions in this Act for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and clerk hire for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

##### CONSULTING SERVICES

SEC. 204. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting serv-

ice through procurement contract, under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued under existing law.

##### COSTS OF LBFMC

SEC. 205. Amounts available for administrative expenses of any legislative branch entity which participates in the Legislative Branch Financial Managers Council (LBFMC) established by charter on March 26, 1996, shall be available to finance an appropriate share of LBFMC costs as determined by the LBFMC, except that the total LBFMC costs to be shared among all participating legislative branch entities (in such allocations among the entities as the entities may determine) may not exceed \$2,000.

##### LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE

SEC. 206. For fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Architect of the Capitol, in consultation with the District of Columbia, is authorized to maintain and improve the landscape features, excluding streets, in Square 580 up to the beginning of I-395.

##### LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS

SEC. 207. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriation Act.

##### GUIDED TOURS OF THE CAPITOL

SEC. 208. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available to the Architect of the Capitol in this Act may be used to eliminate or restrict guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by employees and interns of offices of Members of Congress and other offices of the House of Representatives and Senate.

(b) At the direction of the Capitol Police Board, or at the direction of the Architect of the Capitol with the approval of the Capitol Police Board, guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by employees and interns described in subsection (a) may be suspended temporarily or otherwise subject to restriction for security or related reasons to the same extent as guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by the Architect of the Capitol.

##### BATTERY RECHARGING STATIONS FOR PRIVATELY OWNED VEHICLES IN PARKING AREAS UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS AT NO NET COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

SEC. 209. (a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “covered employee” means—

- (1) an employee of the Library of Congress; or
- (2) any other individual who is authorized to park in any parking area under the jurisdiction of the Library of Congress on the Library of Congress buildings and grounds.

##### (b) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), funds appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol under the heading “CAPITOL POWER PLANT” under the heading “ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL” in any fiscal year are available to construct, operate, and maintain on a reimbursable basis battery recharging stations in parking areas under the jurisdiction of the Library of Congress on Library of Congress buildings and grounds for use by privately owned vehicles used by covered employees.

(2) VENDORS AUTHORIZED.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Architect of the Capitol may use 1 or more vendors on a commission basis.

(3) APPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION.—The Architect of the Capitol may construct or direct the construction of battery recharging stations described under paragraph (1) after—

(A) submission of written notice detailing the numbers and locations of the battery recharging stations to the Joint Committee on the Library; and

(B) approval by that Committee.

##### (c) FEES AND CHARGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Architect of the Capitol shall charge fees or charges for electricity provided to covered employees sufficient to cover the costs to the Architect of the Capitol to carry out this section, including costs to any vendors or other costs associated with maintaining the battery recharging stations.

(2) APPROVAL OF FEES OR CHARGES.—The Architect of the Capitol may establish and adjust fees or charges under paragraph (1) after—

(A) submission of written notice detailing the amount of the fee or charge to be established or adjusted to the Joint Committee on the Library; and

(B) approval by that Committee.

(d) DEPOSIT AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES, CHARGES, AND COMMISSIONS.—Any fees, charges, or commissions collected by the Architect of the Capitol under this section shall be—

(1) deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriations account described under subsection (b); and

(2) available for obligation without further appropriation during the fiscal year collected.

##### (e) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a report on the financial administration and cost recovery of activities under this section with respect to that fiscal year to the Joint Committee on the Library and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

##### (2) AVOIDING SUBSIDY.—

(A) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act and every 3 years thereafter, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a report to the Joint Committee on the Library determining whether covered employees using battery recharging stations as authorized by this section are receiving a subsidy from the taxpayers.

(B) MODIFICATION OF RATES AND FEES.—If a determination is made under subparagraph (A) that a subsidy is being received, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a plan to the Joint Committee on the Library on how to update the program to ensure no subsidy is being received. If the Joint Committee does not act on the plan within 60 days, the Architect of the Capitol shall take appropriate steps to increase rates or fees to ensure reimbursement for the cost of the program consistent with an appropriate schedule for amortization, to be charged to those using the charging stations.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter.

##### COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT

SEC. 210. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no adjustment shall be made under section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4501) (relating to cost of living adjustments for Members of Congress) during fiscal year 2016.

##### SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 211. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the

House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, excluding Senate items, exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is \$0.

This Act may be cited as the “Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2016”.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 114-120. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. RATCLIFFE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 114-120.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,700,000)”.

Page 37, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,700,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GRAVES and Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for their hard work in crafting this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in this fiscal environment, we have to be better stewards of taxpayer dollars, and we have to scrutinize every program that we allocate money towards. We can't ever forget that every dollar that we spend is a dollar taken from our constituents' hard-earned paychecks. It is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that I have offered this amendment to eliminate funding for the Open World Leadership Center—a program started in 1999 and housed in the Library of Congress with the purpose of bringing leaders from post-Soviet countries to the United States to learn about our legislative process.

The gentleman from California spoke passionately a few minutes ago about his belief that we need to have programs like this, but his comments ignore the fact that there are nearly 90 other similar or nearly identical programs throughout the government aimed at achieving this same goal. At the same time, this program has now spent more than \$150 million towards that duplicative purpose.

So when you consider that duplicative purpose alongside a national debt of \$18.2 trillion, we have got to honestly examine and reconsider whether this is the best use of taxpayer money.

This is especially true when accounts and programs across the legislative branch have seen reductions in recent years, but yet not a single dollar has been cut from the Open World program despite the fact that, after this subcommittee's examination of this program, Chairman GRAVES reported that, “In light of both the lack of quantifiable results from the Open World Leadership Center and its duplications of programs more appropriately offered by the State Department, the program has long outlived its short-term intent.”

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the chairman's assessment, which is, by the way, not a partisan one. In fact, this is the all-too-rare situation and opportunity where Republicans and Democrats, alike, agree that we can cut spending without hurting American citizens.

The American people have entrusted us with the responsibility of seeing that their tax dollars don't go to waste. And while Mr. GRAVES' bill allocates funds to the legislative branch to do the important work that we need to on behalf of the American people, the Open World program is one area where we can and should make this spending cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), the chairman.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for bringing this forward. He has done a lot of work on this topic. He is new to the body—I think everybody knows that—and with haste he has moved to find an area in which we can continue to provide savings for taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment here, and I appreciate his bringing it forward.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague for bringing this amendment and for focusing in on areas where we can actually eliminate spending here in Washington. Again, you have to recognize that about 35 cents of every dollar spent is money borrowed from countries like China, so we ought to be combing every different piece of this budget and finding areas where we can say that this isn't something that the Federal Government should be doing.

It might be a noble program to have exchanges with other countries, but to be spending millions of dollars at a time when our country has needs that aren't being met and that we are borrowing money from other countries and sending that bill to our children, this is a time where we have got to be combing through these kinds of programs, and I want to thank him for his leadership.

□ 1600

This is a time where we have got to be combing through these kind of programs, and I want to thank him for his leadership. This is something that should be eliminated. We shouldn't be spending millions of dollars of taxpayer money to bring people over to this country. If they want to come, we welcome them.

Many countries do send people over here to observe how democracy works; we send people on occasion to other countries to spread democracy, but there are duplications in so many other areas of our budget where this is already being done, and this is just one more area where we ought to be saving taxpayers' money and being fiscally responsible.

This isn't something we can afford to do; it isn't something we should be doing. I am glad the gentleman is bringing the amendment to eliminate this spending. I support it and hope the House approves it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to note for the Members that this would be the first time that I am actually opposing an amendment that cuts the Open World program.

Initially, when I became chair of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee 8 years ago, this program was at \$14 million. I have consistently tried to cut this program and move its funding to the State Department bill for every single year since then. We have not been successful, but we are only at \$5.7 million now, which is a more appropriate amount.

We are, as I said, in general debate. This funding going somewhere else in the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill would be more appropriate. Since we are sending it out of the bill in a bill that is already inadequately funded, it is not an amendment I can support.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), who wishes to speak in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for the time. I also want to thank the subcommittee chairman, Mr. GRAVES, for the gentlemanly way in which we have conducted this debate.

This is a transpartisan issue. We have got Democrats and Republicans divided on each side of the aisle, which is a bit unusual, but nonetheless, this is important.

I support the Open World Leadership Center. I am on its board. It has been mentioned that this is better nested within the State Department. The State Department does have a myriad of programs. However, this is a legislative branch program, and we should not outsource our responsibility there.

This program was formed in the wake of the fall of the Soviet Union in order to give a chance for the development of legal structures, stabilized civil society, and the opportunity for democracy to evolve. While the primary focus was on Russia, that component has been suspended, and this program has taken a very substantial cut down from \$10 million to about \$6 million now.

To jettison it gets rid of very important deliverables. Over 23,000 judges, politicians, emerging civil society leaders, and young people have participated in this program, including 15 members of Ukraine's parliament, 15 members of Moldova's parliament, 8 Russian governors; 51 percent of the participants are women.

Mr. Chairman, the military tells me: Send us in last.

We will send billions and billions of dollars of lethal military aid to a country, but the military says: Do everything you can to build up good will and trust and relationships in stable societies so that we do not have to resort to what none of us wants to resort to.

The Open World Leadership Center fulfills that role in an effective way. There are changes that I hope will be forthcoming to make it more effective in the future. I hope we will preserve this important legislative priority which cannot be replicated, essentially, by the State Department.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. At this time, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and as someone who served as ranking member for this subcommittee back several years ago, I just want to express my support and the work for the Open World Leadership Center than the opposed amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

I am sure it is well intended, but I do want to say that I think that this amendment is not going in the right direction. We do need to keep this partnership. It is a partnership. It is a relationship that has developed with these former Soviet countries.

I think it is very important. It has served us well. It is a program that a lot of people say is duplicated in other agencies of government, but I will say it is unique. It is a unique approach to working across borders to highlight the critical role of the legislative branch in emerging democracies.

I just want to say that I support this bill as it currently is and would oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, can you tell me how much time we have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for the time.

I rise in strong opposition to the Ratcliffe amendment.

If anyone has been watching, you have seen Russia's invasion of Ukraine. Now, more than ever, it is critical to engage with rising stars in the former Soviet Union because the old tactics of Soviet Russia are still being employed.

This program belongs to Congress. Yes, it is a legislative branch program, so it is small; it is efficient; it is ours. It is our one tool to reach out to these countries to their rising leaders to expand accountable governance and the rule of law. Who better to teach it than those engaged, those of us who communicate with citizens in these countries that so very much want to be free?

Open World directly connects us with changemakers in this very, very fluid region of the world. It reaches beyond the big cities, into the country side. I personally have greeted some of the leaders that have come from several countries, including Moldova and Ukraine.

Let me tell you, it will be our generation and the next that will pay the price if this amendment is passed. We simply must engage with this part of the world. We cannot leave her in the hands of the Russian bear.

I urge very strong opposition to the Ratcliffe amendment.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 30 seconds remaining. The gentlewoman from Florida has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. At this time, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to respond that there is no legislative program in the State Department like this. You can't transfer it there. They are not operative in these countries, so to say that this could be moved over—look, you were in professional organizations.

This is legislator to legislator, judge to judge, and we need to keep it that way.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, my constituents sent me to Washington to cut wasteful spending. The Open World program is one of many, many programs that have the same purpose throughout the Federal Government. This is a chance to cut \$5 million in spending for a duplicative program that we simply don't need.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of passage of the Ratcliffe amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, what this

amendment is, is a missed opportunity to be fiscally responsible.

I also support not spending money on the Open World program any longer and moving it to the State Department. Unfortunately, the majority has chosen to make a rule in order that focuses on an amendment to shift the \$5.7 million completely out of the legislative branch when we have plaster falling off buildings, elevators badly in need of repair, we have cuts to our MRA—our office accounts—our staff that isn't well paid enough; and it just not responsible.

This is a missed opportunity. I urge the Members, unfortunately, to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 114-120.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of the Congressional Pictorial Directory to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a simple amendment to prohibit funds for delivering printed copies of the Congressional Pictorial Directory in the House of Representatives.

The pictorial directory is a book with pictures of Members of Congress printed by the Government Publishing Office. The most recent edition cost over \$200,000 to print and distribute. While I realize this is not much money, I think with an \$18 trillion debt, that we need to be looking for the pennies, as well as the \$100 bills.

The most important thing is this book is no longer necessary to print in hard copy. We are almost 6 months into the 114th Congress, and the GPO has still not published the book. During the 113th Congress, it took the GPO 9 months, until September, to release the pictorial directory. Here is what one of them looks like.



Private groups make similar directories that are actually more useful and include contact information and biographies of Members, in addition to their pictures. I have a copy of the directory that was dropped off at my office by a trade association in the last few days, and unlike the GPO directory, it is up to date, and they keep it up to date.

Of course, pictures of Members of Congress are readily available for free online. If needed, the Clerk could ensure that appropriate photographs of current Members are available to create an online pictorial directory.

The language of this amendment mirrors several riders already in the bill that prohibit funds for the delivery of printed copies of bills and resolutions, printed copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, printed copies of the statements of disbursements, and printed copies of the daily calendar.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I think it is worth stating for the RECORD that this amendment would maybe save somewhere between \$9,000 and \$29,000. I mean, let's bear the full impact of that weighty sum, depending on how it is interpreted.

This is an amendment that would prevent the delivery of a printed copy that I have in my hand of the Congressional Pictorial Directory—which, by the way, Mr. FLORES, no offense, but some of us used this directory to identify you during the course of this discussion.

This is a book that is actually necessary and one that we shouldn't be farming out or relying on lobbyists to print for us.

Every year, we seem to get an amendment that stops some sort of printing or delivery of a paper copy of some document to Member offices.

Just so Members know, we have actually made real savings in this bill in the past—in the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill—by no longer delivering a printed copy of a bill unless a Member requests a copy; we no longer deliver the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to Member offices; we no longer allow more than 50 printed copies of the Code to go to House offices; we no longer deliver a printed copy of the statements of disbursement to Member offices; we no longer deliver a printed copy of the daily calendar to Member offices—all of which cost far more than stopping the printing of these books.

It isn't really realistic to expect Members to print out a piece of paper—or staff—and carry around a whole bunch of printed faded copies of paper to help identify Members. We have new Members every 2 years.

My point is we are about out of low-hanging fruit here. I hope this is the last of this type of amendment because, if we want to change printing, the Members have an opportunity to take their grievances up with the Joint Committee on Printing.

The distribution of the Congressional Pictorial Directory is actually set by the Joint Committee on Printing. Maybe the gentleman is unaware of that, and it doesn't need to be legislated through this bill. We don't need to be creating a false impression that we are actually saving taxpayer dollars that would not have been saved through another means.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlewoman from Florida made a great case for putting this book in the same stack of dinosaurs that she was talking about when it comes to eliminating all other waste in terms of government printing.

I have an app that cost me \$1.99 that gives me current pictures of Members of Congress. I don't have to carry any paper around. I don't have to carry this book around. I don't have to carry this book around. I just have to have an app.

Look, we are a 21st century Congress. Why don't we act like a 21st century Congress and get rid of the dinosaurs like this?

□ 1615

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FLORES. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am wondering whether that app was privately produced or was produced by taxpayers. As for the \$1.99 that you spent on it, were those taxpayer dollars you used to pay for it or from your own personal funds?

Mr. FLORES. That was my personal money.

Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, my point is that it would be one thing if a congressional tutorial directory were unnecessary, but that is not the case. It is necessary. What isn't necessary is for us to be wasting time in debate on the House floor over something that could actually be handled differently. If the gentleman or any other Member thought that the Joint Committee on Printing should handle it differently, just go talk to them.

Instead, what we are doing is pretending that we are actually saving taxpayer dollars. This is about \$9,000, and what we shouldn't be doing is outsourcing the things that we need in terms of the materials to do a better job serving the public to lobbyists and the private sector. That does not make sense, and it isn't necessary, and the majority should not leave the impression that they are actually doing something fiscally responsible here.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, this has been a fascinating discussion. The gentlewoman from Florida claims that the savings are between \$9,000 and \$29,000 while the numbers that we have are \$200,000. If you ask your typical hard-working family if \$9,000 is a lot of money, they will say, yes, it is. Is \$29,000 a lot of money? They will say yes. Is \$200,000 a lot of money? They will say yes. If you say, "You are paying for that. Would you like the government to stop wasting that money?" then they would say, absolutely, yes.

If the gentlewoman does not want to waste any time on this and vote "aye," then let's stop.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I will point out that the gentleman's amendment does not actually stop the printing of the pictorial directory. It simply stops the delivery of the directory to Members' offices. So it does not provide the savings that the gentleman is talking about. It provides between \$9,000 and \$29,000 because the only cost that he is saving is on the delivery and not on the printing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I read the amendment's intent as well. As the ranking member just stated and as the argument seems to go around in a circle here, it doesn't stop the printing of these items, of these directories. It just says that Members of Congress shouldn't have somebody privately deliver them to their offices. If they want one, go get one. If they want to look it up online, look it up online. If they want to spend \$1.99 and get an app, they can get an app. This just says that the Congressional Pictorial Directory is just not going to be delivered to a Member's office. I don't know how controversial that can be.

I thank the gentleman for his amendment.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I conclude by pointing out that the offerer of the amendment, and the chairman, are suggesting that now we should print things that we don't use. If that isn't an example of a waste of taxpayer dollars in suggesting that we should print this document but not make sure that it is delivered to Members' offices for their utilization, that pretty much sounds like government waste under the classic definition.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

The amendment was agreed to.



AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS.  
BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 114–120.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ (a) Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

(b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to—

(1) accounts under the heading “Capitol Police”;

(2) “Architect of the Capitol—Capitol Police Buildings, Grounds and Security”; or

(3) the amount provided for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms under the heading “House of Representatives—Salaries, Officers and Employees”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to begin by thanking the subcommittee chairman for his hard work on this effort that is in front of us and for the committee’s identifying ways to reduce what the Federal Government spends, especially in the leg branch.

The fiscal year 2016 proposed funding level is \$3.3 billion. That is \$173 billion below the President’s request. I think there is more work that we could do, and my 1 percent across-the-board spending reduction will save taxpayers an additional \$29 million in budget authority and \$25 million in outlays for fiscal year 2016. It is a targeted cut in discretionary spending that exempts the Capitol Police, the Sergeant at Arms, and security maintained by the Architect of the Capitol.

Again, as I said, I want to recognize the work of Chairman GRAVES and his committee. They have done several very important things that, I think, we ought to highlight.

First, this measure continues to freeze Member pay in place, where it has been since 2010. Second, it continues a 14 percent reduction in funding for the House of Representatives, which Republicans began in 2011. I appreciate that Chairman ROGERS brought attention to that as general debate began. Third, the bill cuts funding for programs such as the Government Publishing Office, which we have just been discussing—many programs that have outlived their usefulness.

We can cut more, and a penny on a dollar is worth the effort. We are a country that has over \$18 trillion in debt. Financial security has become an issue of national security. Admiral Mullen said the greatest threat to our Nation’s security is our growing national debt. That is a reason for our

getting our fiscal house in order and looking to future generations and saying, let’s go in and cut one more penny out of a dollar. This effort that I bring before you would do just that—one more cent—and do it for future generations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

It takes a meat-ax approach to cutting this bill by over \$29 million with an across-the-board cut of 1 percent. I want to point out that it also exempts the Capitol Police and its buildings, as well as the Sergeant at Arms.

If the gentlewoman, who I know offers these amendments over and over again, were truly committed to an across-the-board cut, then she would just simply offer an across-the-board cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this.

This is a mindless but easy cut. Tough words. By the way, this is sequester, which is a Republican proposal. It started in about 2011 but, really, before that with all of these across-the-board cuts because you don’t have to make any choices, and you don’t have to make priorities. You just say, Oh, let’s save money.

Frankly, so many of the people in this country want this Congress to have vigorous oversight of the executive department, which has expanded very substantially while the legislature has continued to undermine its ability to function as an effective oversight agency of the American people. The legislative branch is underfunded. We do not have the capacity to do the effective oversight as we ought to be doing. The Department of Veterans Affairs is a perfect example of that where we were not vigorous enough in oversight to ensure that money was being applied properly.

If you want to cut and if you want to say something—this is not good; that is not good; we are wasting money there—then specify it. Debate that issue up or down. That is why sequester is so abysmally wrong and why the chairman of the committee called it unrealistic and ill-conceived. This is not Obama’s proposal of a sequester. I am not talking about this amendment, but to say, as you repeatedly say on your side of the aisle, that this is Obama’s proposal is baloney. In fact, the only reason Jack Lew suggested that to Reid as an option was because you—and I refer to the Republican friends on the other side of the aisle—

were threatening not to honor the Nation’s debt.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. That is the only reason we passed sequester, and nobody intended sequester to go into effect. It was always a backup. Because we have failed to come to an agreement on a fiscally responsible, sustainable path, we have repaired to this ill-conceived, unrealistic concept of sequester. This 1 percent across the board is exactly that. It puts intellect on hold and judgment on hold. That is not why the American people sent us here.

Reject this amendment. Respect this institution, and respect our responsibility to the American people.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 15 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words about one part of the bill that I find very troubling. This is a cut that is a penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Last year, we named the GPO as the Government Publishing Office, and that is because of the range of digital services that it provides. This year, the Legislative Branch Subcommittee voted to cut those operations by eliminating the appropriated funding for the GPO’s Federal digital system, which provides free digital access to more than a million congressional and other government document titles that have been downloaded by the public more than 1 billion times over the past 5 years. It does not make sense. Cutting this will severely eliminate money to upgrade the GPO’s Federal digital system and the new search and retrieval system.

In recognition of the fiscal pressures we all face, the GPO came in with a flat budget request this year, asking only that we support the commitment to their digital transformation. We said “yes” to it last year, and I am hopeful that we can restore that funding this year. It makes no sense to cut this. There are millions of people in local libraries all across this country who depend on this digital system, and we do not need to cut it. This is penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Mr. Chair, as a former Member of the House Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, I wanted to say a few words about one part of this year’s spending bill which I find very troubling.

A year ago, Congress and the President agreed to rename GPO as the Government Publishing Office, based on the broad range of

digital services the agency now provides. The Subcommittee supported this legislative change.

This year, the House Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee voted to cut those operations by eliminating appropriated funding for GPO's Federal Digital System, which provides free digital access to more than 1 million congressional and other Government document titles that have been downloaded by the public more than 1 billion times over the past five years. This cut just doesn't make sense.

It will severely curtail GPO's ability to add new digital documents to its Federal Digital System. It will zero out the funding for initiatives that support the missions of congressional and legislative branch organizations such as the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Library of Congress who rely on information from the Federal Digital System to feed websites such as Congress.gov and Docs.House.gov.

GPO's Federal Digital System, though just 5 years old, is already beginning to show its age. The rapid changes in today's digital technical environment remind us why it's essential for GPO to keep up with the times.

But this funding cut will eliminate money to upgrade GPO's Federal Digital System with a new search and retrieval system, an improved user interface, and other needed hardware and software improvements, including migrating the system to the cloud. Due to the critical role the Federal Digital System plays in making our legislative information transparent and available online, we need to make this investment.

In recognition of the fiscal pressures we all face, GPO came in with a flat budget request this year, asking only that we support their commitment to their digital transformation. We said yes to that transformation last year, and I am hopeful that we can restore this funding in the final legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I find it so interesting that this is called a "meat-ax approach." Yes, I do come regularly to offer these amendments, because I care what happens with our Nation. I care about our future, and I want to make certain that we are on solid financial footing. We have a responsibility to be good stewards of the taxpayers' money. It is their money.

To say this is mindless and easy, how interesting that is. Go tell all of the Governors from coast to coast—Democrat and Republican—who use across-the-board spending cuts to get budgets in balance. Tell that to mayors who use this same process. The reason it is done is it works. It helps the bureaucracy hold itself accountable, and that is absolutely what we ought to be doing at this point in time.

As you can see, cutting is a very emotional issue. Cutting brings forward a lot of emotions. Talking about doing more with less, being resourceful, that is what we should do every single day. In order to be a good steward of the taxpayers' money, we should want to do more with less. We should do it in the name of freedom, for freedom's sake—for the sovereignty of this Nation.

Ill-conceived and unrealistic? When is operating by a balanced budget and

spending and living within the means the taxpayers have said they are going to have for this Federal Government ever considered ill-conceived? When would it be considered unrealistic? It is what we ought to be doing. Indeed, if every department did what the legislative branch did of cutting 14 percent, we would be getting close to budget.

To say that we are suspending intellect and judgment, do you know that is almost frivolous and almost silly to say.

□ 1630

We spend less and should be spending less and should try to continue to spend less and reform this government and hold it accountable to the taxpayer who is footing the bill because, yes, the Nation's future depends on it; our national security, yes, depends on it; and respect, it is respecting future generations and the taxpayer to be a wise steward.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield 30 seconds of my remaining time to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, I wish the gentleman had made that same speech when we were discussing defense, the biggest spending bill we have, but she didn't offer this amendment at all.

I happen to come from a State where the legislators didn't have enough guts to raise taxes, so the people went out and did it because they want their government to run wisely and smartly, and they knew they didn't have enough money to do it.

Look, we are cutting this budget; yet the Senate, which we don't vote on their bit, is increasing their budget by 12 percent. They are going to be able to give cost-of-living adjustments to every one of their Members. Nobody sitting in this room who works for us is going to get a cost-of-living adjustment because of cuts like this. This is ridiculous. We are penalizing our whole House, not the Senate. This is not a smart way to make legislative business.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 15 seconds remaining.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. To close, Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is that what would be fiscally responsible and responsible in general is to not further take a meat ax to a bill that has already been flat-funded for the last 3 years. Our employees deserve a raise. We deserve to be able to be a coequal branch of government, funded well enough to be able to hold the administration accountable and make sure we can do our jobs. This bill does not allow us to achieve that.

I urge the Members to oppose this irresponsible amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 114-120 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. RATCLIFFE of Texas.

Amendment No. 3 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. RATCLIFFE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 199, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 245]

AYES—224

Abraham	Crenshaw	Hartzler
Allen	Cuellar	Heck (NV)
Amash	Culberson	Hensarling
Amodei	Curbelo (FL)	Herrera Beutler
Babin	Davis, Rodney	Hice, Jody B.
Barletta	Denham	Hill
Barr	DeSantis	Holding
Barton	DesJarlais	Hudson
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Huelskamp
Bishop (MI)	Duffy	Huizenga (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Black	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Blackburn	Ellmers (NC)	Hurd (TX)
Blum	Emmer (MN)	Hurt (VA)
Bost	Farenthold	Issa
Boustany	Fincher	Jenkins (KS)
Brady (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (WV)
Brat	Fleischmann	Johnson (OH)
Bridenstine	Fleming	Johnson, Sam
Brooks (AL)	Flores	Jolly
Brooks (IN)	Forbes	Jones
Buchanan	Fox	Jordan
Buck	Franks (AZ)	Joyce
Bucshon	Garrett	Katko
Burgess	Gibbs	Kelly (PA)
Byrne	Gohmert	King (IA)
Calvert	Goodlatte	King (NY)
Carter (GA)	Gosar	Kirkpatrick
Carter (TX)	Gowdy	Kline
Chabot	Granger	Knight
Clawson (FL)	Graves (GA)	Labrador
Coffman	Graves (LA)	LaMalfa
Collins (GA)	Graves (MO)	Lamborn
Collins (NY)	Griffith	Lance
Comstock	Grothman	Latta
Conaway	Guinta	LoBiondo
Cook	Guthrie	Long
Costello (PA)	Hardy	Loudermilk
Cramer	Harper	Love
Crawford	Harris	Lucas

Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meadows  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Pittenger

Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratchliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Robby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schrader  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shuster

Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoho  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

## NOES—199

Adams  
Aderholt  
Aguilar  
Ashford  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Benishek  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cole  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Dent  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo

Esty  
Farr  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Gibson  
Graham  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Pallone  
Hanna  
Hastings  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Connolly  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe y  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney  
Maloney, Sean

Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moulton  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Hahn  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roskam  
Ross  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Shinkus  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Titus

Tonko  
Torres  
Turner  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela

Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman

Welch  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Young (AK)

Brady (PA)  
Capps  
Chaffetz

Donovan  
Fattah  
Garamendi

Moore  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Tsongas

## NOT VOTING—9

□ 1700

Ms. KUSTER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Messrs. HANNA, SCHWEIKERT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. YODER, HIMES, and DENT changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. WESTMORELAND, GRAVES of Missouri, SHUSTER, CRAWFORD, and SMITH of Texas changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS.

## BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 250, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 246]

## AYES—172

Allen  
Amash  
Ashford  
Babin  
Barton  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cooper  
Crawford  
Curbelo (FL)  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Duffy

Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)

Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Jenkins (KS)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Katko  
King (IA)  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Marchant  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Messer  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)

Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Olson  
Palmer  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratchliffe  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Roe (TN)  
Rohrabacher

Rokita  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shuster

Emmer (MN)  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gibson  
Graham  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanna  
Hastings  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jolly  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
MacArthur

Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Marino  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
McNerney  
Meng  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Newhouse  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Nugent  
Nunes  
O'Rourke  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Roby  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rooney (FL)  
Roskam  
Ross  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Shinkus  
Simpson  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stefanik

Stewart	Turner	Watson Coleman
Stivers	Van Hollen	Webster (FL)
Swalwell (CA)	Vargas	Welch
Takai	Veasey	Whitfield
Takano	Vela	Wilson (FL)
Thompson (CA)	Velázquez	Womack
Thompson (MS)	Visclosky	Yarmuth
Thompson (PA)	Walden	Yoho
Thornberry	Walz	Young (AK)
Titus	Wasserman	
Tonko	Schultz	
Torres	Waters, Maxine	

## NOT VOTING—10

Brady (PA)	Fattah	Sanchez, Loretta
Capps	Meeks	Tsongas
Chaffetz	Mica	
Donovan	Moore	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1707

Mr. GARAMENDI changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 246 my voting card did not record and if it had recorded, it would be a “yes.” I would have recorded my vote as “yes.”

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2250) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 271, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, this 5-minute vote on passage of H.R. 2250 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to recommit on H.R. 2353, and passage of H.R. 2353, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 357, nays 67, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 247]

## YEAS—357

Abraham	Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer
Adams	Fleischmann	Lujan Grisham
Aderholt	Fleming	(NM)
Aguilar	Flores	Luján, Ben Ray
Allen	Forbes	(NM)
Amodei	Fortenberry	Lummis
Ashford	Foster	Lynch
Babin	Fox	MacArthur
Barletta	Frankel (FL)	Maloney
Barr	Frelinghuysen	Carolyn
Barton	Fudge	Maloney, Sean
Beatty	Gabbard	Marchant
Becerra	Gallego	Marino
Benishek	Garamendi	Matsui
Bera	Garrett	McCarthy
Beyer	Gibbs	McCaul
Bilirakis	Gibson	McClintock
Bishop (GA)	Gohmert	McCollum
Bishop (MI)	Goodlatte	McHenry
Bishop (UT)	Gosar	McKinley
Black	Gowdy	McMorris
Blackburn	Graham	Rodgers
Blum	Granger	McNerney
Bonamici	Graves (GA)	McSally
Bost	Graves (LA)	Meadows
Boustany	Graves (MO)	Meehan
Brady (TX)	Grayson	Messer
Brat	Griffith	Mica
Bridenstine	Grothman	Miller (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Guinta	Miller (MI)
Brownley (CA)	Guthrie	Moolenaar
Buchanan	Gutiérrez	Mooney (WV)
Buck	Hahn	Mullin
Bucshon	Hanna	Mulvaney
Burgess	Hardy	Murphy (FL)
Bustos	Harper	Murphy (PA)
Butterfield	Harris	Nadler
Byrne	Hartzer	Neugebauer
Calvert	Heck (NV)	Newhouse
Carney	Heck (WA)	Noem
Carson (IN)	Hensarling	Nolan
Carter (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Norcross
Carter (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Nugent
Cartwright	Higgins	Nunes
Castor (FL)	Hill	O'Rourke
Castro (TX)	Himes	Olson
Chabot	Hinojosa	Palazzo
Chu, Judy	Holding	Pallone
Cicilline	Hudson	Palmer
Clawson (FL)	Huelskamp	Paulsen
Coffman	Huffman	Pearce
Cole	Huizenga (MI)	Perlmutter
Collins (GA)	Hultgren	Perry
Collins (NY)	Hunter	Peters
Comstock	Hurd (TX)	Peterson
Conaway	Hurt (VA)	Pingree
Connolly	Issa	Pittenger
Cook	Jenkins (KS)	Pitts
Cooper	Jenkins (WV)	Poe (TX)
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Poliquin
Costello (PA)	Johnson (OH)	Polis
Courtney	Johnson, Sam	Pompeo
Cramer	Jolly	Posey
Crawford	Jones	Price, Tom
Crenshaw	Jordan	Quigley
Crowley	Joyce	Rangel
Cuellar	Kaptur	Ratcliffe
Culberson	Katko	Reed
Curbelo (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Reichert
Davis (CA)	Kelly (PA)	Renacci
Davis, Danny	Kildee	Ribble
Davis, Rodney	Kilmer	Rice (SC)
DeFazio	King (IA)	Richmond
Delaney	King (NY)	Rigell
DeLauro	Kinzinger (IL)	Roby
DelBene	Kirkpatrick	Roe (TN)
Denham	Kline	Rogers (AL)
Dent	Knight	Rogers (KY)
DeSantis	Kuster	Rohrabacher
DeSaulnier	Labrador	Rokita
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Rooney (FL)
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Dingell	Lance	Roskam
Doggett	Langevin	Ross
Dold	Larsen (WA)	Rothfus
Duckworth	Latta	Rouzer
Duffy	Lawrence	Royce
Duncan (SC)	Lieu, Ted	Ruiz
Duncan (TN)	Lipinski	Ruppersberger
Edwards	LoBiondo	Rush
Ellison	Loeb sack	Russell
Elmiers (NC)	Long	Ryan (WI)
Emmer (MN)	Loudermillk	Salmon
Esty	Love	Sánchez, Linda
Farenthold	Lowenthal	T.
Fincher	Lucas	Sanford

Sarbanes	Stewart	Walden
Scalise	Stivers	Walker
Schiff	Stutzman	Walorski
Schrader	Swalwell (CA)	Walters, Mimi
Schweikert	Takai	Walz
Scott (VA)	Takano	Watson Coleman
Scott, Austin	Thompson (CA)	Weber (TX)
Scott, David	Thompson (PA)	Webster (FL)
Sensenbrenner	Thornberry	Welch
Serrano	Tiberi	Wenstrup
Sessions	Tipton	Westerman
Sewell (AL)	Titus	Westmoreland
Sherman	Tonko	Whitfield
Shimkus	Torres	Williams
Shuster	Trott	Wilson (SC)
Simpson	Turner	Womack
Sinema	Upton	Woodall
Sires	Valadao	Yoder
Slaughter	Van Hollen	Yoho
Smith (MO)	Vargas	Young (AK)
Smith (NE)	Veasey	Young (IA)
Smith (NJ)	Vela	Young (IN)
Smith (TX)	Velázquez	Zeldin
Speier	Wagner	Zinke
Stefanik	Walberg	

## NAYS—67

Amash	Franks (AZ)	Meng
Bass	Green, Al	Moulton
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Napolitano
Boyle, Brendan	Grijalva	Neal
F.	Hastings	Pascarell
Brooks (AL)	Honda	Payne
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Pelosi
Capuano	Israel	Pocan
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Clark (MA)	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kind	Smith (WA)
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Thompson (MS)
Conyers	Lee	Visclosky
Cummings	Levin	Wasserman
DeGette	Lewis	Schultz
Deutch	Lofgren	Waters, Maxine
Doyle, Michael	Lowey	Wilson (FL)
F.	Massie	Wittman
Engel	McDermott	Yarmuth
Eshoo	McGovern	
Farr	Meeks	

## NOT VOTING—8

Brady (PA)	Donovan	Sanchez, Loretta
Capps	Fattah	Tsongas
Chaffetz	Moore	

□ 1716

Mr. CUMMINGS changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. DOGGETT changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION  
FUNDING ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 2353) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 241, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 248]

## YEAS—182

Adams Gabbard Napolitano  
 Aguilar Gallego Neal  
 Ashford Garamendi Nolan  
 Bass Graham Norcross  
 Beatty Grayson O'Rourke  
 Becerra Green, Al Pallone  
 Bera Green, Gene Pascarell  
 Beyer Grijalva Payne  
 Bishop (GA) Gutiérrez Pelosi  
 Blumenauer Hahn Perlmutter  
 Bonamici Hastings Peters  
 Boyle, Brendan Heck (WA) Peterson  
 F. Higgins Pingree  
 Brown (FL) Himes Pocan  
 Brownley (CA) Hinojosa Polis  
 Bustos Honda Price (NC)  
 Butterfield Hoyer Quigley  
 Capuano Huffman Rangel  
 Cárdenas Israel Rice (NY)  
 Carney Jackson Lee Richmond  
 Carson (IN) Jeffries Roybal-Allard  
 Cartwright Johnson (GA) Ruiz  
 Castor (FL) Johnson, E. B. Ruppersberger  
 Castro (TX) Kaptur Rush  
 Chu, Judy Keating Ryan (OH)  
 Cicilline Kelly (IL) Sánchez, Linda  
 Clark (MA) Kennedy T.  
 Clarke (NY) Kildee Sarbanes  
 Clay Kilmer Schakowsky  
 Cleaver Kind Schiff  
 Clyburn Kirkpatrick Schrader  
 Cohen Kuster Scott (VA)  
 Connolly Langevin Scott, David  
 Conyers Larsen (WA) Serrano  
 Cooper Larson (CT) Sewell (AL)  
 Costa Lawrence Sherman  
 Courtney Lee Sinema  
 Crowley Levin Sires  
 Cuellar Lewis Slaughter  
 Cummings Lieu, Ted Smith (WA)  
 Davis (CA) Lipinski Speier  
 Davis, Danny Loeb sack Swalwell (CA)  
 DeFazio Lofgren Takai  
 DeGette Lowenthal Takano  
 Delaney Lowey Thompson (CA)  
 DeLauro Lujan Grisham Thompson (MS)  
 DelBene (NM) Titus  
 DeSaulnier Luján, Ben Ray Tonko  
 Deutch (NM) Torres  
 Dingell Lynch Van Hollen  
 Doggett Maloney, Vargus  
 Doyle, Michael Carolyn Veasey  
 F. Maloney, Sean Vela  
 Duckworth Matsui Velázquez  
 Edwards McCollum Visclosky  
 Ellison McDermott Walz  
 Engel McGovern Wasserman  
 Eshoo McMorris Schultz  
 Esty Meeks Waters, Maxine  
 Farr Meng Watson Coleman  
 Foster Moulton Welch  
 Frankel (FL) Murphy (FL) Wilson (FL)  
 Fudge Nadler Yarmuth

## NAYS—241

Abraham Chabot Flores  
 Aderholt Clawson (FL) Forbes  
 Allen Coffman Fortenberry  
 Amash Cole Foss  
 Amodei Collins (GA) Franks (AZ)  
 Babin Collins (NY) Frelinghuysen  
 Barletta Comstock Garrett  
 Barr Conaway Gibbs  
 Barton Cook Gibson  
 Benishek Costello (PA) Gohmert  
 Bilirakis Cramer Goodlatte  
 Bishop (MI) Crawford Gosar  
 Bishop (UT) Crenshaw Gowdy  
 Black Culberson Granger  
 Blackburn Curbelo (FL) Graves (GA)  
 Blum Davis, Rodney Graves (LA)  
 Bost Denham Graves (MO)  
 Boustany Dent Griffith  
 Brady (TX) DeSantis Grothman  
 Brat DesJarlais Guinta  
 Bridenstine Diaz-Balart Guthrie  
 Brooks (AL) Dold Hanna  
 Brooks (IN) Duncan (SC) Hardy  
 Buchanan Duncan (TN) Harper  
 Buck Ellmers (NC) Harris  
 Bucshon Emmer (MN) Hartzler  
 Burgess Farenthold Heck (NV)  
 Byrne Fincher Hensarling  
 Calvert Fitzpatrick Herrera Beutler  
 Carter (GA) Fleischmann Hice, Jody B.  
 Carter (TX) Fleming Hill

Holding Hudson  
 Huelskamp Miller (FL)  
 Huizenga (MI) Miller (MI)  
 Hultgren Mooleenaar  
 Hunter Mooney (WV)  
 Hurd (TX) Mullin  
 Hurt (VA) Mulvaney  
 Issa Murphy (PA)  
 Jenkins (KS) Neugebauer  
 Jenkins (WV) Newhouse  
 Johnson (OH) Noem  
 Johnson, Sam Nugent  
 Jolly Nunes  
 Jones Olson  
 Jordan Palazzo  
 Joyce Palmer  
 Katko Paulsen  
 Kelly (PA) Pearce  
 King (IA) Perry  
 King (NY) Pittenger  
 Kinzinger (IL) Pitts  
 Kline Poe (TX)  
 Knight Poliquin  
 Labrador Pompeo  
 LaMalfa Posey  
 Lamborn Price, Tom  
 Lance Ratcliffe  
 Latta Reed  
 LoBiondo Reichert  
 Long Renacci  
 Loudermilk Ribble  
 Love Rice (SC)  
 Lucas Rigell  
 Luetkemeyer Roby  
 Lummis Roe (TN)  
 MacArthur Rogers (AL)  
 Mar chant Rogers (KY)  
 Marino Rohrabacher  
 Massie Rokita  
 McCarthy Rooney (FL)  
 McCaul Ros-Lehtinen  
 McClintock Roskam  
 McHenry Ross  
 McKinley Rothfus  
 McMorris Rouzer  
 Rodgers Royce  
 McSally Russell  
 Meadows Ryan (WI)  
 Meehan Salmon

## NOT VOTING—9

Brady (PA) Donovan  
 Capps Duffy  
 Chaffetz Fattah

□ 1723

Mr. ADERHOLT changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 387, noes 35, answered “present” 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 249]

## AYES—387

Abraham Beatty Blumenauer  
 Adams Benishek Bonamici  
 Aderholt Bera Bost  
 Aguilar Beyer Boustany  
 Allen Bilirakis Boyle, Brendan  
 Ashford Bishop (GA) F.  
 Babin Bishop (MI) Brady (TX)  
 Barletta Bishop (UT) Brat  
 Barr Black Brooks (AL)  
 Barton Blackburn Brooks (IN)  
 Bass Blum Brown (FL)

Brownley (CA) Sanford  
 Buchanan Scalise  
 Buck Schweikert  
 Bucshon Scott, Austin  
 Burgess Sensenbrenner  
 Bustos Sessions  
 Butterfield Shimkus  
 Byrne Shuster  
 Calvert Simpson  
 Capuano Smith (MO)  
 Cárdenas Smith (NE)  
 Carson (IN) Smith (NJ)  
 Carter (GA) Smith (TX)  
 Carter (TX) Stefanik  
 Cartwright Stewart  
 Castor (FL) Stivers  
 Castro (TX) Stutzman  
 Chabot Thompson (PA)  
 Chu, Judy Thornberry  
 Cicilline Tiberi  
 Clark (MA) Tipton  
 Clarke (NY) Trott  
 Clay Turner  
 Coffman Upton  
 Cohen Valadao  
 Cole Wagner  
 Collins (GA) Walberg  
 Collins (NY) Walden  
 Comstock Walker  
 Conaway Walorski  
 Connolly Walters, Mimi  
 Conyers Weber (TX)  
 Cook Webster (FL)  
 Cooper Wenstrup  
 Costa Westerman  
 Costello (PA) Westmoreland  
 Cramer Whitfield  
 Crawford Williams  
 Crenshaw Wilson (SC)  
 Cuellar Wittman  
 Culberson Womack  
 Cummings Woodall  
 Curbelo (FL) Yoder  
 Davis (CA) Yoho  
 Davis, Danny Young (AK)  
 Davis, Rodney Young (IA)  
 DeFazio Young (IN)  
 Delaney Zeldin  
 DelBene Zinke  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DeSantis  
 DesJarlais  
 Deutch  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Dold  
 Doyle, Michael  
 F.  
 Duckworth  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Ellmers (NC)  
 Emmer (MN)  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Esty  
 Farenthold  
 Farr  
 Fincher  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fleischmann  
 Fleming  
 Flores  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Foster  
 Foss  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Fudge  
 Gabbard  
 Gallego  
 Garamendi  
 Garrett  
 Gibbs  
 Gibson  
 Gohmert  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Graham  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (LA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Grayson  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Griffith  
 Grijalva  
 Grothman  
 Guinta  
 McHenry  
 Guthrie  
 Gutiérrez  
 Hahn  
 Hanna  
 Hardy  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Heck (NV)  
 Hensarling  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Hice, Jody B.  
 Hill  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McHenry  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 McSally  
 Meadows  
 Meehan  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Mullin  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Neugebauer  
 Newhouse  
 Noem  
 Nolan  
 Norcross  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 O'Rourke  
 Olson  
 Palazzo  
 Pallone  
 Palmer  
 Paulsen  
 Payne  
 Pearce  
 Pelosi  
 Perry  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Pingree  
 Pittenger  
 Pitts  
 Pocan  
 Poe (TX)  
 Poliquin  
 Pompeo  
 Posey  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rangel  
 Ratcliffe  
 Reed  
 Reichert  
 Rigell  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Rooney (FL)  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Ross  
 Rothfus  
 Rouzer  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppersberger  
 Rush  
 Russell  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Sanford  
 Sarbanes  
 Scalise  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schweikert  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, Austin  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Sherman  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Sinema

Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Titus

## NOES—35

Amash  
Becerra  
Bridenstine  
Carney  
Clawson (FL)  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Courtney  
Crowley  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DeSaulnier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Jordan  
Kildee  
Kind  
Larson (CT)  
Maloney, Sean  
Moulton  
Mulvaney  
Pascarell  
Perlmutter  
Polis  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roskam  
Salmon  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Schradler  
Sensenbrenner  
Visclosky  
Welch

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Amodio

## NOT VOTING—9

Brady (PA)  
Capps  
Chaffetz  
Donovan  
Fattah  
Moore  
Rice (SC)  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Tsongas

□ 1731

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

MR. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following rollcall votes on May 19, 2015 and would like the record to reflect that I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 243: "no," rollcall No. 244: "yes," rollcall No. 245: "no," rollcall No. 246: "no," rollcall No. 247: "yes," rollcall No. 248: "yes," rollcall No. 249: "yes."

## REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 1909

MR. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members be removed as cosponsors of the bill, H.R. 1909: Mr. FARENTHOLD of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING of Texas, Mr. HUELSKAMP of Kansas, and Mr. THORNBERY of Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the

vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

## AMERICAN SUPER COMPUTING LEADERSHIP ACT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 874) to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

## H.R. 874

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Super Computing Leadership Act".

## SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 2 of the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 5541) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (5) and inserting the following:

"(1) CO-DESIGN.—The term 'co-design' means the joint development of application algorithms, models, and codes with computer technology architectures and operating systems to maximize effective use of high-end computing systems.

"(2) DEPARTMENT.—The term 'Department' means the Department of Energy.

"(3) EXASCALE.—The term 'exascale' means computing system performance at or near 10 to the 18th power floating point operations per second.

"(4) HIGH-END COMPUTING SYSTEM.—The term 'high-end computing system' means a computing system with performance that substantially exceeds that of systems that are commonly available for advanced scientific and engineering applications.

"(5) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801).

"(6) LEADERSHIP SYSTEM.—The term 'leadership system' means a high-end computing system that is among the most advanced in the world in terms of performance in solving scientific and engineering problems.

"(7) NATIONAL LABORATORY.—The term 'National Laboratory' means any one of the seventeen laboratories owned by the Department.

"(8) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Energy.

"(9) SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY.—The term 'software technology' includes optimal algorithms, programming environments, tools, languages, and operating systems for high-end computing systems."

## SEC. 3. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY HIGH-END COMPUTING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Section 3 of the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 5542) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "program" and inserting "coordinated program across the Department";

(B) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (1);

(C) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting "and"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) partner with universities, National Laboratories, and industry to ensure the broadest possible application of the technology developed in this program to other challenges in science, engineering, medicine, and industry.";

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking "vector" and all that follows through "architectures" and inserting "computer technologies that show promise of substantial reductions in power requirements and substantial gains in parallelism of multicore processors, concurrency, memory and storage, bandwidth, and reliability"; and

(3) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

"(d) EXASCALE COMPUTING PROGRAM.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a coordinated research program to develop exascale computing systems to advance the missions of the Department.

"(2) EXECUTION.—The Secretary shall, through competitive merit review, establish two or more National Laboratory-industry-university partnerships to conduct integrated research, development, and engineering of multiple exascale architectures, and—

"(A) conduct mission-related co-design activities in developing such exascale platforms;

"(B) develop those advancements in hardware and software technology required to fully realize the potential of an exascale production system in addressing Department target applications and solving scientific problems involving predictive modeling and simulation and large-scale data analytics and management; and

"(C) explore the use of exascale computing technologies to advance a broad range of science and engineering.

"(3) ADMINISTRATION.—In carrying out this program, the Secretary shall—

"(A) provide, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, access for researchers in United States industry, institutions of higher education, National Laboratories, and other Federal agencies to these exascale systems, as appropriate; and

"(B) conduct outreach programs to increase the readiness for the use of such platforms by domestic industries, including manufacturers.

"(4) REPORTS.—

"(A) INTEGRATED STRATEGY AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the American Super Computing Leadership Act, a report outlining an integrated strategy and program management plan, including target dates for prototypical and production exascale platforms, interim milestones to reaching these targets, functional requirements, roles and responsibilities of National Laboratories and industry, acquisition strategy, and estimated resources required, to achieve this exascale system capability. The report shall include the Secretary's plan for Departmental organization to manage and execute the Exascale Computing Program, including definition of the roles and responsibilities within the Department to ensure an integrated program across the Department. The report shall also include a plan for ensuring balance and prioritizing across ASCR subprograms in a flat or slow-growth budget environment.

"(B) STATUS REPORTS.—At the time of the budget submission of the Department for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that describes the status of milestones and costs in achieving the objectives of the exascale computing program.

“(C) EXASCALE MERIT REPORT.—At least 18 months prior to the initiation of construction or installation of any exascale-class computing facility, the Secretary shall transmit a plan to the Congress detailing—

“(i) the proposed facility’s cost projections and capabilities to significantly accelerate the development of new energy technologies;

“(ii) technical risks and challenges that must be overcome to achieve successful completion and operation of the facility; and

“(iii) an independent assessment of the scientific and technological advances expected from such a facility relative to those expected from a comparable investment in expanded research and applications at terascale-class and petascale-class computing facilities, including an evaluation of where investments should be made in the system software and algorithms to enable these advances.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 874, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 874, the American Super Computing Leadership Act, requires the Department of Energy to develop a plan to bring the United States into the next generation of supercomputing, also known as exascale computing. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) for taking the initiative on this issue.

DOE’s Advanced Scientific Computing Research program is the primary Federal research and development program for innovation in computing technology. High-performance computing has paved the way for breakthroughs in medical imaging, genetics research, manufacturing, engineering, and weapons development.

Faster computing speeds have revolutionized the energy sector, improved the efficiency of energy production, and aided in distribution technologies. Advances in computer modeling offer opportunities for scientific discovery in fields where experiments are too difficult, costly, or dangerous to conduct. These advances reduce costs and open the door to more innovative discoveries.

The country with the strongest computing capability will host the world’s next scientific breakthroughs. Unfortunately, China currently holds the world’s fastest computer, not the United States. This bill should reverse this trend and help advance American competitiveness.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN),

as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY), and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for their initiative on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor H.R. 874, the American Super Computing Leadership Act. This is bipartisan legislation that I have had the pleasure of working on with my colleague, Mr. HULTGREN, as well as others from both sides of the aisle in developing, including, as the chairman said, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. ESTY. This bill would authorize an exascale computing program to ensure that the fastest computers in the world, as well as their software and algorithms, which will help us use these machines to the maximum efficiency, are developed here in the United States.

The term “exascale” is often used to refer to the next generation of supercomputers in general and is used interchangeably with “extreme scale.” This term is often applied to computing systems that are capable of carrying out a million trillion operations per second. That rate is approximately 50 times faster than the current fastest computer in the world.

Through this legislation, the Secretary of Energy would be empowered to significantly increase the computing power that is accessible to scientists from Federal agencies as well as industry and academia. These investments would have a wide range of impacts by giving the Nation’s best scientists the resources and support they need to flourish.

Mr. Speaker, there are numerous fields of research in both the academic and industrial areas that would be greatly aided by this increased computing power. Fields such as pharmaceutical development, aerodynamic modeling for aircraft and vehicle design, advanced nuclear reactor design and fusion plasma modeling, combustion simulation to assist in the design of fuel-efficient clean engines, and high temperature superconductivity to significantly reduce energy losses while transmitting electricity.

As a result of this legislation, the Department of Energy would be required to submit regular reports as well as a management plan to Congress describing how DOE intends to institute this program and its current projects. Lemont, Illinois’ Argonne National Laboratory is a world leader in developing this new capability, so I am happy that just last month the Department of Energy announced a major award to support and significantly upgrade Argonne’s advanced computing research and facilities. This bill will ensure that these investments are part

of a transparent, long-term, coordinated strategy to keep the United States on top in this field. I also anticipate that the benefits that we will see from this legislation may well surpass the impacts that we can even imagine today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 874, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), who is a sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to thank my good friend and distinguished chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Chairman SMITH from Texas, as well as my good friend, Congressman LIPINSKI from Illinois, as well as my other good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) all for helping to bring this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 874 will help ensure that America stays at the forefront of supercomputing technology by getting to the exascale level of computing—close to the speed of the human brain. These capabilities are vital for our national security, the economy, and, more broadly, the research capabilities of our Nation.

While America and American companies are still leading the way for much of this current technology, it is important to point out that the National University of Defense Technology in China now houses the world’s fastest computer.

One of the Department of Energy’s primary responsibilities within the National Nuclear Security Administration is the maintenance of our current nuclear stockpile. This stockpile stewardship responsibility is carried out with increasingly complex simulations as our stockpile ages. The need for improved parallelism capabilities and decreased energy requirements are spelled out in this legislation to ensure the Department carries out a targeted basic research program to overcome the most pressing needs.

I would like to point out, however, that I believe, in agreement with the Secretary, that exascale is not the end point. It is just a step towards the greater goal of American leadership in this field.

This legislation will ensure that the broader scientific community has access to these facilities on a competitive merit review basis. The scientific drivers and the national security responsibilities should be the primary focus for computing research, but we must also make sure that the crosscutting benefits of this research are not left at the wayside.

H.R. 874 would create partnerships with universities, industry, and the national labs to conduct this research, ensuring that the Nation, as a whole, benefits from this research more quickly and efficiently. With all parties at the table, businesses will be better able



to utilize the new technologies and algorithms that will result.

Having the pleasure to represent the great State of Illinois, I have been able to witness how an ecosystem of innovation can best be fostered. For our Nation to reap the greatest yields from our research, our research facilities must be open to the public when it makes sense and does not interfere with the core missions of our Federal agencies and the labs.

The user facilities in our national labs already serve over 30,000 researchers every year, with university researchers taking precedence over others. And other user facilities, such as the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne, Illinois, have given a tremendous research capability to industry partners, such as pharmaceutical companies, where research that once took weeks is now done in hours, with samples spending more time in overnight mail.

Mr. Speaker, the computing capabilities this legislation will help bring about will similarly have tremendous application in health care and drug development. We are just now getting to the point where computer simulations are giving us higher resolution images at the molecular level than we can get with microscopes when trying to understand how diseases, our bodies, and new treatments interact. And the modeling simulations these systems make available also allow manufacturers to build better prototypes that have already been tested thousands of times virtually before they come off the line.

But perhaps most importantly, these capabilities will keep America competitive on the global scale. And the graduate students and postdocs that learn on these machines will take what they know wherever they decide to go, whether it be business or the Department of Defense.

□ 1745

He said the best form of technology transfer wears shoes. That is why I thank my colleagues for helping me bring this similar legislation to the floor again this Congress, and I recommend all my colleagues support this bill.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, does the gentleman from Texas have any more speakers on this bill?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers on this side, so I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time after the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close here.

I want to thank Mr. HULTGREN again. He represents Fermilab. I represent part of Argonne National Laboratory. It is good to work with him on this legislation and others to advance science in the United States. Even though there are few people who really understand what this means, we will all see the results of it.

I thank the chairman for moving this bill forward. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 874.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SCIENCE PRIZE COMPETITIONS ACT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1162) to make technical changes to provisions authorizing prize competitions under the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1162

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Science Prize Competitions Act".

### SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO PRIZE COMPETITIONS.

Section 24 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3719) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting "competition" after "section, a prize";

(B) by inserting "types" after "following"; and

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking "prizes" and inserting "prize competitions";

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking "in the Federal Register" and inserting "on a publicly accessible Government website, such as www.challenge.gov,"; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking "prize" and inserting "cash prize purse";

(3) in subsection (g), by striking "prize" and inserting "cash prize purse";

(4) in subsection (h), by inserting "prize" before "competition" both places it appears;

(5) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting "prize" before "competition";

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting "prize" before "competition" both places it appears;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) WAIVER.—An agency may waive the requirement under paragraph (2). The annual report under subsection (p) shall include a list of such waivers granted during the preceding fiscal year, along with a detailed explanation of the reasons for granting the waivers.";

(6) in subsection (k)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting "prize" before "competition"; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting "prize" before "competitions" both places it appears;

(7) in subsection (l), by striking all after "may enter into" and inserting "a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other agreement with a private sector for-profit or nonprofit entity to administer the prize competition, subject to the provisions of this section.";

(8) in subsection (m)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Support for a prize competition under this section, including financial support for the design and administration of a prize competition or funds for a cash prize purse, may consist of Federal appropriated funds and funds provided by private sector for-profit and nonprofit entities. The head of an agency may accept funds from other Federal agencies, private sector for-profit entities, and nonprofit entities, to be available to the extent provided by appropriations Acts, to support such prize competitions. The head of an agency may not give any special consideration to any private sector for-profit or nonprofit entity in return for a donation.";

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "prize awards" and inserting "cash prize purses";

(C) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(i) by striking "No prize" and inserting "No prize competition"; and

(ii) by striking "the prize" and inserting "the cash prize purse";

(D) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking "a prize" and inserting "a cash prize purse";

(E) in paragraph (3)(B)(i), by inserting "competition" after "prize";

(F) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking "a prize" and inserting "a cash prize purse"; and

(G) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking "cash prizes" and inserting "cash prize purses";

(9) in subsection (n), by inserting "for both for-profit and nonprofit entities," after "contract vehicle";

(10) in subsection (o)(1), by striking "or providing a prize" and insert "a prize competition or providing a cash prize purse"; and

(11) in subsection (p)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking "cash prizes" both places it occurs and inserting "cash prize purses"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(G) PLAN.—A description of crosscutting topical areas and agency-specific mission needs that may be the strongest opportunities for prize competitions during the upcoming 2 fiscal years.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1162, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1162, the Science Prize Competitions Act, promotes increased utilization of prize competitions within the Federal Government.

I want to thank the ranking member of the Oversight Subcommittee, Mr. BEYER, for introducing this legislation. I also thank the bipartisan cosponsors, which include the vice chair of the Oversight Subcommittee, Mr. BILL JOHNSON, as well as the full committee ranking member, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

Prize competitions help spur innovation. They give innovators incentives to produce groundbreaking, outside-the-box ideas. Used effectively, prize competitions can be a tool to generate revolutionary results that wouldn't happen otherwise.

For example, after the Deepwater Horizon explosion, the X Prize Foundation sponsored a competition to elicit new oil removal technologies that needed to be better than state of the art. With the incentive of a million-dollar prize for first place, the winning team designed technology capable of extracting 89 percent of the oil from the water.

Thanks to the incentives provided by the competition, the winner, in a few months, blew the competition and the then best available oil skimmers out of the water.

Another example of a novel idea for a prize involves the Head Health Challenge. This is a joint effort by the National Football League, Under Armour, General Electric, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology to produce "viable materials that will result in increased safety and protection for athletes, the warfighter, and civilians."

This is a competition that could yield a solution that would benefit a diverse section of the population, from athletes to soldiers.

H.R. 1162 makes important changes to the prize competitions section of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980. It better defines the role of the private sector in various aspects of prize competitions. H.R. 1162 will have a positive impact on science prize competitions, which have bipartisan support.

A letter from the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy proclaims the values of such competitions by stating:

This report details the remarkable benefits the Federal Government has reaped from more than 400 prize competitions and challenges implemented by over 72 agencies to date, the steps the administration has taken to establish a lasting foundation for use of the COMPETES prize authority, and detailed examples from fiscal year 2014 of how the COMPETES prize authority is increasing the number of agencies that use prizes to achieve their missions more efficiently and effectively.

Again, I want to thank Mr. BEYER of Virginia and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio for introducing this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank two Texans, Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member

JOHNSON, for their leadership on this important issue and remind them that Samuel Houston and Stephen Austin were both born in Virginia. I also would like to thank my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) for cosponsoring.

The 2010 COMPETES reauthorization granted all Federal agencies the authority to hold prize competitions as an incentive for scientific and technological innovations.

This authority supports agencies' increased use of prizes to incentivize more high-risk, high-reward research and reach out to a new audience of researchers and innovators across all areas of science and technology.

Prize competitions go back at least 300 years, to the 1714 Longitude Prize offered by the British Government to develop a practical method to precisely measure a ship's longitude. The 1919 Orteig Prize spurred Charles Lindbergh to make the first transatlantic flight. Of course, it took 8 years from the prize to the flight itself.

In more recent years, prize competitions have accelerated technological development for space exploration, public health, automobiles, lighting, and much more. Many of these competitions have been privately sponsored, but several have been sponsored by our Federal agencies, including NASA, DARPA, and the Department of Energy.

Prize competitions have also proven to be an effective tool to invigorate our Nation's brightest innovators from all corners. They allow our science agencies to cast a wide net to draw in new talent.

I think one of the most interesting facts is that NASA found that over 80 percent of NASA prize competitors have never before responded to NASA or other government requests for proposals. We are bringing in our best and brightest to solve these problems.

If we are to continue leading the world in science and technology, we must draw up on all of our Nation's talent, whether they are researchers in a university lab, owners of a technology start-up, or independent innovators working in their own garages.

Imagine if more of our Federal science agencies took full advantage of the potential of prizes to address some of our Nation's most pressing technological challenges. How might the world be changed in 2025 from a prize offered today?

Private organizations have spent years perfecting the design of prize competitions to address big challenges. We hope that our science agencies will see this same success, and we must continue to support Federal agencies as they implement this authority.

The legislation we are considering today addresses some real and some perceived hurdles in the 2010 authority that were identified once agencies began to implement prize competitions.

It also aligns the terminology with the industry standard to eliminate any

confusion in the interpretation of the law. These are technical amendments, which should make it easier for all agencies to make full use of the 2010 authority. In trying to rebalance our Federal budget, we have had to make very hard choices about where to cut funding, including in R&D programs.

While prize competitions should never be used as an excuse to cut our investments in R&D, prizes do allow the Federal Government to continue to fund high-reward research with minimal risk to the taxpayer. They are another valuable tool for agencies to deploy to meet their critical mission responsibilities.

I am proud to cosponsor this bill and ask my colleagues for their support. I am very grateful for the chairman for his bipartisan leadership on this issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for reminding me that Stephen Austin and Samuel Houston were born in Virginia, and I have to confess, I have a number of ancestors who came from Virginia as well, and I am told one of them may have even been the Governor of Virginia, but that is as much as I am going to say about the great Commonwealth tonight.

I will say that I have no other requests for time; and I, again, reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I misspoke. I would love to acknowledge my colleague from Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Virginia ask unanimous consent to reclaim his time?

Mr. BEYER. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I just was going to say I concur and agree to yield to the gentleman from Illinois as well.

Mr. BEYER. As I slowly develop my mastery of this parliamentary procedure, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BEYER for yielding and for his introduction, his authorship of this bill on prize competitions.

I want to add my voice in strong support of this bill. I have long been a strong supporter of prize competitions to spur innovation not as a substitute for Federal grants in other aid, but as an additional tool.

Back in 2007, I wrote language in the Energy Independence and Security Act that directed DOE to create a hydrogen energy prize, a competition now called the H-Prize that is currently ongoing and, hopefully, will yield some results

in innovation in using hydrogen as a transportation fuel.

In the 2010 COMPETES bill, I added language to that bill that authorized prize competitions at the National Science Foundation. I believe that these prize competitions are an excellent way to unlock the innovative potential of researchers, the private sector, and even hobbyists working in a garage, all while protecting taxpayer dollars.

This bill will clarify prize competition authority so that more agencies of the Federal Government will be able to run competitions. It is a good bill. I thank Mr. BEYER, again, for introducing it; I thank Chairman SMITH for moving it and Ranking Member JOHNSON for moving it.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1162, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT EFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1119) to improve the efficiency of Federal research and development, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1119

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Research and Development Efficiency Act”.

#### SEC. 2. REGULATORY EFFICIENCY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) high and increasing administrative burdens and costs in Federal research administration, particularly in the higher education sector where most federally sponsored research is performed, are eroding funds available to carry out basic scientific research;

(2) progress has been made over the last decade in streamlining the pre-award grant application process through Grants.gov, the Federal Government’s website portal;

(3) post-award administrative costs have grown as Federal research agencies have continued to impose agency-unique compliance and reporting requirements on researchers and research institutions;

(4) facilities and administration costs at research universities can exceed 50 percent of the total value of Federal research grants, and it is estimated that nearly 30 percent of the funds invested annually in federally funded research is consumed by paperwork and other administrative processes required by Federal agencies; and

(5) it is a matter of critical importance to American competitiveness that administrative costs of federally funded research be streamlined so that a higher proportion of taxpayer dollars flow into direct research activities.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish a working group under the authority of the National Science and Technology Council, to include the Office of Management and Budget. The working group shall be responsible for reviewing Federal regulations affecting research and research universities and making recommendations on how to—

(1) harmonize, streamline, and eliminate duplicative Federal regulations and reporting requirements;

(2) minimize the regulatory burden on United States institutions of higher education performing federally funded research while maintaining accountability for Federal tax dollars; and

(3) identify and update specific regulations to refocus on performance-based goals rather than on process while still meeting the desired outcome.

(c) STAKEHOLDER INPUT.—In carrying out the responsibilities under subsection (b), the working group shall take into account input and recommendations from non-Federal stakeholders, including federally funded and nonfederally funded researchers, institutions of higher education, scientific disciplinary societies and associations, nonprofit research institutions, industry, including small businesses, federally funded research and development centers, and others with a stake in ensuring effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability in the performance of scientific research.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for 3 years, the Director shall report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on what steps have been taken to carry out the recommendations of the working group established under subsection (b).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1119, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK), the Science Committee’s Research and Technology Subcommittee chairwoman and the sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 1119, the Research and Development Efficiency Act, which I introduced with the chairman and ranking member of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, as well as the rank-

ing member of the Research and Technology Subcommittee earlier this year.

H.R. 1119 requires the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to establish a working group under the National Science and Technology Council to review Federal regulations that affect research and research universities.

The working group is tasked with making recommendations on how to harmonize, streamline, and eliminate duplicative Federal regulations and reporting requirements and make recommendations on how to minimize the regulatory burden on research institutions.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, there is a long history to support the need for this legislation. In 2012, the National Academies issued a report that included a key recommendation to “reduce or eliminate regulations that increase administrative costs, impede research productivity, and deflect creative energy without substantially improving the research environment.”

Last year, the National Science Board referenced the results of two Federal Demonstration Partnership surveys on faculty workload—one in 2005 and one in 2012—that, on average, researchers spend 42 percent of their time on meeting administrative requirements. This drain on researchers’ time and resources to answer Federal regulatory and reporting requirements leaves less time for researchers to spend on actual scientific work.

To be clear, H.R. 1119 does not eliminate reporting requirements, because there is a need for such information for the purposes of oversight and transparency. Instead, the bill would initiate the process that should ultimately help researchers and research universities by reducing redundant regulations. This is accomplished by promoting efficiencies and getting the most out of our research investments.

The National Academies is currently conducting a study of Federal regulations and reporting requirements, paying particular attention to those directed at research universities. H.R. 1119 would ensure that more of our Federal research dollars are spent on research and not on regulatory requirements. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1119, the Research and Development Efficiency Act.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill, and I want to thank Congresswoman COMSTOCK and Ranking Member JOHNSON for their leadership in introducing the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we all agree that administrative requirements serve an important purpose. They ensure transparency, the protection of human and animal subjects, and the wise use of Federal resources. But sometimes they

go too far, so we need to find a much better balance than we currently have.

The statistic often cited is that federally funded researchers spend an average of 42 percent of their time on administrative tasks. That is time and money spent not doing science. It is not an efficient use of some of our Nation's greatest scientific brain power, nor is it an efficient use of Federal research funds, especially as Federal spending for R&D continues to decline as a share of the overall budget.

Back in the 112th Congress, the Research Subcommittee, which I served on as ranking member and which was led by then-Chairman MO BROOKS, held an important hearing on this matter to help get the ball rolling, which eventually led to this bill.

H.R. 1119 requires the Office of Science and Technology Policy to convene an interagency working group to review the requirements governing the conduct of federally funded R&D at our Nation's research institutions. The working group is further charged with making recommendations on how to best streamline and harmonize such requirements across the government in order to minimize the administrative burden on universities while maintaining full accountability for Federal funds.

This administration has long recognized the problems that this bill addresses. An interagency working group will not be starting from scratch. The Office of Management and Budget took some small steps in the right direction in their recent rewrite of the Federal regulations governing research grants. Agencies have also taken steps to harmonize the grant proposal process and are exploring additional ways to reduce the paperwork burden associated with grant proposals.

I applaud these efforts. Last Congress, I helped further them by writing a letter to OMB, urging them to make some of the reforms they had agreed to. However, there is still room to go. The National Academies have begun a detailed review of administrative burdens on federally funded research. I hope that this review will yield specific recommendations for the agencies on how to proceed. While it may be preferable to wait for this report to be published before the interagency committee begins its own work, the Academies' review does not preclude the need for an interagency group.

I understand that there may be bureaucratic hurdles to overcome. This will take some time. However, we cannot afford to delay action any longer. The vitality of our Nation's research universities and of our overall competitiveness will suffer if we do not reduce the administrative workload on our Nation's scientific talent. H.R. 1119 is an important step in that direction.

Once again, I want to thank Chairwoman COMSTOCK and Ranking Member JOHNSON of the Research and Technology Subcommittee for introducing this legislation, and I thank Chairman

SMITH for bringing it to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Again, I want to thank Chairwoman COMSTOCK, Chairman SMITH, and Ranking Member JOHNSON for moving this bill.

I used to be a university researcher. I know of the heavy burdens in terms of administrative tasks that need to be done. I would say some of these are absolutely necessary, but we now know that we can reduce the burden without reducing the protections that they provide. I am very happy to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, really quickly, I want to thank Mrs. COMSTOCK for introducing this bill and Mr. LIPINSKI for cosponsoring it. As well, it is a great bipartisan piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1119, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COOPERATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1156) to authorize the establishment of a body under the National Science and Technology Council to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation opportunities, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1156

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "International Science and Technology Cooperation Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. COORDINATION OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish or designate a working group under the National Science and Technology Council with the responsibility to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation that can strengthen the United States science and technology enterprise, improve economic and national security, and support United States foreign policy goals.

(b) NSTC WORKING GROUP MEMBERSHIP.—The working group established under subsection (a) shall be co-chaired by officials from the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the Department of State.

(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The working group established under subsection (a) shall—

(1) plan and coordinate interagency international science and technology cooperative research and training activities and partnerships supported or managed by Federal agencies and work with other National Science and Technology Council committees to help plan and coordinate the international component of national science and technology priorities;

(2) establish Federal priorities and policies for aligning, as appropriate, international science and technology cooperative research and training activities and partnerships supported or managed by Federal agencies with the foreign policy goals of the United States;

(3) identify opportunities for new international science and technology cooperative research and training partnerships that advance both the science and technology and the foreign policy priorities of the United States;

(4) in carrying out paragraph (3), solicit input and recommendations from non-Federal science and technology stakeholders, including universities, scientific and professional societies, industry, and relevant organizations and institutions; and

(5) identify broad issues that influence the ability of United States scientists and engineers to collaborate with foreign counterparts, including barriers to collaboration and access to scientific information.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall transmit a report, to be updated every 2 years, to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. The report shall also be made available to the public on the reporting agency's website. The report shall contain a description of—

(1) the priorities and policies established under subsection (c)(2);

(2) the ongoing and new partnerships established since the last update to the report;

(3) the means by which stakeholder input was received, as well as summary views of stakeholder input; and

(4) the issues influencing the ability of United States scientists and engineers to collaborate with foreign counterparts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1156, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1156, the International Science and Technology Cooperation Act of 2015, directs the Office of Science and Technology Policy to establish a working group to identify and coordinate international science and technology efforts to strengthen the U.S. research enterprise.

I thank the ranking member of the Research and Technology Subcommittee, Mr. LIPINSKI, for introducing this bill. I also thank the subcommittee's vice chair, Mr. MOOLENAAR, the ranking member of the full committee, Ms. JOHNSON, as well as our colleagues Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. SWALWELL for being bipartisan cosponsors.

The Office of Science and Technology Policy, in coordination with the State Department, represents the United States in bilateral and multilateral meetings with foreign nations. It works closely with government science agencies, nongovernmental organizations, and independent research and scientific institutions to promote science and technology initiatives and to strengthen global science cooperation.

H.R. 1156 improves our Nation's collaborative efforts with international partners on scientific issues. While many Federal agencies are engaged with international partners on science and technology projects, there is a need to coordinate these projects across the Federal Government. Better collaboration with our partners will strengthen U.S. scientific activities and further promote the free exchange of ideas with other nations. Interagency coordination ensures that taxpayer dollars are used efficiently and that U.S. priorities are consistently addressed when working with our international partners on science and technology issues.

Science and technology research addresses some of the major challenges that face our Nation, including public health, energy production, national security, and economic development. Coordinated international collaboration on scientific issues, which H.R. 1156 promotes, also will improve economic and national security and support U.S. foreign policy goals.

Again, I want to thank Mr. LIPINSKI for his continued hard work on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1156, the International Science and Technology Cooperation Act, which I reintroduced earlier this year.

A similar bill, which I authored in the last Congress, passed the House with overwhelming bipartisan support by a vote of 346-41. I am hopeful that we can do the same this week and then work to get this bill through the Senate and onto the President's desk.

I want to thank Mr. MOOLENAAR for cosponsoring this bill with me, and I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON for helping advance it through the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and for getting it to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, the laws of science know no political boundaries. While the United States arguably has the

most brilliant scientists in the world and has developed some of the greatest technology, no country has a monopoly on great minds in science and technology. So, if we want to advance science in ways that benefit Americans and the rest of the world, we need to encourage international collaboration.

Improvements in areas such as energy security, infectious diseases, space exploration, telecommunications and the Internet, and many more are due, in part, to international cooperation, to the benefit of all nations involved. By collaborating with international partnerships on science, we also strengthen the U.S. scientific enterprise, which helps us get the best return on our research investment.

In addition, international collaborations make possible research endeavors on a grander scale than the U.S. can accomplish on its own. For example, CERN, the U.S. Department of Energy, and the National Science Foundation signed a cooperative agreement 2 weeks ago expanding their collaboration on particle physics. Not only will this provide for our scientists to continue work at the highest energy accelerator in the world at CERN, it will also allow CERN to provide equipment to an upcoming neutrino experiment at Fermilab in Batavia, Illinois.

CERN was the site of one of the most significant technological advances that impacts us every day. At CERN in 1989, Tim Berners-Lee was working on the problem of allowing international researchers to see data instantaneously around the globe. The solution that was developed was the World Wide Web, which has completely transformed the way we communicate and get information today.

H.R. 1156 makes more collaborations like this possible. It requires the National Science and Technology Council at the White House to continue to maintain a working group to coordinate the U.S. interagency strategy for international science and technology cooperation. Many Federal agencies already work with international counterparts on scientific and technological issues, but, until recently, there was no coordinating body to identify new partnerships and to fully leverage existing collaborations.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we find ways to collaborate with other countries on scientific discoveries that push the boundaries of knowledge and improve our lives. This bill will do that. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Again, I want to thank the chairman for his support on this. As I said, we have passed this bill before with wide bipartisan support. I am very hopeful we can do that again today.

International cooperation is very critical to doing more than we alone can do. We have, arguably, the best researchers in the world, producing the most advanced technology, but in working together with others, we can do even more than we have. The impact

that it can have on the everyday lives of Americans is tremendous, so I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1815

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1156, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the establishment or designation of a working group under the National Science and Technology Council to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation opportunities."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECASTING INNOVATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1561) to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1561

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. PUBLIC SAFETY PRIORITY.

In accordance with NOAA's critical mission to provide science, service, and stewardship, the Under Secretary shall prioritize weather research, across all weather programs, to improve weather data, forecasts, and warnings for the protection of life and property and the enhancement of the national economy.

#### SEC. 3. WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECASTING INNOVATION.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Assistant Administrator for OAR shall conduct a program to develop improved understanding of and forecast capabilities for atmospheric events and their impacts, placing priority on developing more accurate, timely, and effective warnings and forecasts of high impact weather events that endanger life and property.

(b) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—The program described in subsection (a) shall focus on the following activities:

(1) Improving the fundamental understanding of weather consistent with section

2, including the boundary layer and other atmospheric processes affecting high impact weather events.

(2) Improving the understanding of how the public receives, interprets, and responds to warnings and forecasts of high impact weather events that endanger life and property.

(3) Research and development, and transfer of knowledge, technologies, and applications to the NWS and other appropriate agencies and entities, including the American weather industry and academic partners, related to—

(A) advanced radar, radar networking technologies, and other ground-based technologies, including those emphasizing rapid, fine-scale sensing of the boundary layer and lower troposphere, and the use of innovative, dual-polarization, phased array technologies;

(B) aerial weather observing systems;

(C) high performance computing and information technology and wireless communication networks;

(D) advanced numerical weather prediction systems and forecasting tools and techniques that improve the forecasting of timing, track, intensity, and severity of high impact weather, including through—

(i) the development of more effective mesoscale models;

(ii) more effective use of existing, and the development of new, regional and national cloud-resolving models;

(iii) enhanced global weather models; and

(iv) integrated assessment models;

(E) quantitative assessment tools for measuring the impact and value of data and observing systems, including OSSEs (as described in section 8), OSEs, and AOAs;

(F) atmospheric chemistry and interactions essential to accurately characterizing atmospheric composition and predicting meteorological processes, including cloud microphysical, precipitation, and atmospheric electrification processes, to more effectively understand their role in severe weather; and

(G) additional sources of weather data and information, including commercial observing systems.

(4) A technology transfer initiative, carried out jointly and in coordination with the Assistant Administrator for NWS, and in cooperation with the American weather industry and academic partners, to ensure continuous development and transition of the latest scientific and technological advances into NWS operations and to establish a process to sunset outdated and expensive operational methods and tools to enable cost-effective transfer of new methods and tools into operations.

(C) EXTRAMURAL RESEARCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program under this section, the Assistant Administrator for OAR shall collaborate with and support the non-Federal weather research community, which includes institutions of higher education, private entities, and nongovernmental organizations, by making funds available through competitive grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that not less than 30 percent of the funds for weather research and development at OAR should be made available for the purpose described in paragraph (1).

(d) REPORT.—The Under Secretary shall transmit to Congress annually, concurrently with NOAA's budget request, a description of current and planned activities under this section.

#### SEC. 4. TORNADO WARNING IMPROVEMENT AND EXTENSION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary, in collaboration with the American weather in-

dustry and academic partners, shall establish a tornado warning improvement and extension program.

(b) GOAL.—The goal of such program shall be to reduce the loss of life and economic losses from tornadoes through the development and extension of accurate, effective, and timely tornado forecasts, predictions, and warnings, including the prediction of tornadoes beyond one hour in advance.

(c) PROGRAM PLAN.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Administrator for OAR, in coordination with the Assistant Administrator for NWS, shall develop a program plan that details the specific research, development, and technology transfer activities, as well as corresponding resources and timelines, necessary to achieve the program goal.

(d) BUDGET FOR PLAN.—Following completion of the plan, the Under Secretary, acting through the Assistant Administrator for OAR, in coordination with the Assistant Administrator for NWS, shall transmit annually to Congress a proposed budget corresponding to the activities identified in the plan.

#### SEC. 5. HURRICANE FORECAST IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary, in collaboration with the American weather industry and academic partners, shall maintain the Hurricane Forecast Improvement Program (HFIP).

(b) GOAL.—The goal of such program shall be to develop and extend accurate hurricane forecasts and warnings in order to reduce loss of life, injury, and damage to the economy.

(c) PROGRAM PLAN.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Administrator for OAR, in consultation with the Assistant Administrator for NWS, shall develop a program plan that details the specific research, development, and technology transfer activities, as well as corresponding resources and timelines, necessary to achieve the program goal.

(d) BUDGET FOR PLAN.—Following completion of the plan, the Under Secretary, acting through the Assistant Administrator for OAR, in consultation with the Assistant Administrator for NWS, shall transmit annually to Congress a proposed budget corresponding to the activities identified in the plan.

#### SEC. 6. WEATHER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PLANNING.

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Under Secretary, acting through the Assistant Administrator for OAR, in coordination with the Assistant Administrators for NWS and NESDIS, shall issue a research and development and research to operations plan to restore and maintain United States leadership in numerical weather prediction and forecasting that—

(1) describes the forecasting skill and technology goals, objectives, and progress of NOAA in carrying out the program conducted under section 3;

(2) identifies and prioritizes specific research and development activities, and performance metrics, weighted to meet the operational weather mission of NWS to achieve a weather-ready Nation;

(3) describes how the program will collaborate with stakeholders, including the American weather industry and academic partners; and

(4) identifies, through consultation with the National Science Foundation, American weather industry, and academic partners, research necessary to enhance the integration

of social science knowledge into weather forecast and warning processes, including to improve the communication of threat information necessary to enable improved severe weather planning and decisionmaking on the part of individuals and communities.

#### SEC. 7. OBSERVING SYSTEM PLANNING.

The Under Secretary shall—

(1) develop and maintain a prioritized list of observation data requirements necessary to ensure weather forecasting capabilities to protect life and property to the maximum extent practicable;

(2) undertake, using OSSEs, OSEs, AOAs, and other appropriate assessment tools, ongoing systematic evaluations of the combination of observing systems, data, and information needed to meet the requirements listed under paragraph (1), assessing various options to maximize observational capabilities and their cost-effectiveness;

(3) identify current and potential future data gaps in observing capabilities related to the requirements listed under paragraph (1); and

(4) determine a range of options to address gaps identified under paragraph (3).

#### SEC. 8. OBSERVING SYSTEM SIMULATION EXPERIMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In support of the requirements of section 7, the Assistant Administrator for OAR shall undertake OSSEs to quantitatively assess the relative value and benefits of observing capabilities and systems. Technical and scientific OSSE evaluations—

(1) may include assessments of the impact of observing capabilities on—

(A) global weather prediction;

(B) hurricane track and intensity forecasting;

(C) tornado warning lead times and accuracy;

(D) prediction of mid-latitude severe local storm outbreaks; and

(E) prediction of storms that have the potential to cause extreme precipitation and flooding lasting from 6 hours to 1 week; and

(2) shall be conducted in cooperation with other appropriate entities within NOAA, other Federal agencies, the American weather industry, and academic partners to ensure the technical and scientific merit of OSSE results.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—OSSEs shall quantitatively—

(1) determine the potential impact of proposed space-based, suborbital, and in situ observing systems on analyses and forecasts, including potential impacts on extreme weather events across all parts of the Nation;

(2) evaluate and compare observing system design options; and

(3) assess the relative capabilities and costs of various observing systems and combinations of observing systems in providing data necessary to protect life and property.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—OSSEs—

(1) shall be conducted prior to the acquisition of major Government-owned or Government-leased operational observing systems, including polar-orbiting and geostationary satellite systems, with a lifecycle cost of more than \$500,000,000; and

(2) shall be conducted prior to the purchase of any major new commercially provided data with a lifecycle cost of more than \$500,000,000.

(d) PRIORITY OSSEs.—

(1) GLOBAL NAVIGATION SATELLITE SYSTEM RADIO OCCULTATION.—Not later than December 31, 2015, the Assistant Administrator for OAR shall complete an OSSE to assess the value of data from Global Navigation Satellite System Radio Occultation.

(2) GEOSTATIONARY HYPERSPECTRAL SOUND-ER GLOBAL CONSTELLATION.—Not later than



December 31, 2016, the Assistant Administrator for OAR shall complete an OSSE to assess the value of data from a geostationary hyperspectral sounder global constellation.

(e) **RESULTS.**—Upon completion of all OSSEs, results shall be publicly released and accompanied by an assessment of related private and public sector weather data sourcing options, including their availability, affordability, and cost effectiveness. Such assessments shall be developed in accordance with section 50503 of title 51, United States Code.

#### SEC. 9. COMPUTING RESOURCES PRIORITIZATION REPORT.

Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Under Secretary, acting through the NOAA Chief Information Officer, in coordination with the Assistant Administrator for OAR and the Assistant Administrator for NWS, shall produce and make publicly available a report that explains how NOAA intends to—

(1) continually support upgrades to pursue the fastest, most powerful, and cost effective high performance computing technologies in support of its weather prediction mission;

(2) ensure a balance between the research to operations requirements to develop the next generation of regional and global models as well as highly reliable operational models;

(3) take advantage of advanced development concepts to, as appropriate, make next generation weather prediction models available in beta-test mode to operational forecasters, the American weather industry, and partners in academic and government research; and

(4) use existing computing resources to improve advanced research and operational weather prediction.

#### SEC. 10. COMMERCIAL WEATHER DATA.

(a) **AMENDMENT.**—Section 60161 of title 51, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “This prohibition shall not extend to—

“(1) the purchase of weather data through contracts with commercial providers; or

“(2) the placement of weather satellite instruments on cohosted government or private payloads.”.

##### (b) **STRATEGY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Under Secretary, shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a strategy to enable the procurement of quality commercial weather data. The strategy shall assess the range of commercial opportunities, including public-private partnerships, for obtaining surface-based, aviation-based, and space-based weather observations. The strategy shall include the expected cost effectiveness of these opportunities as well as provide a plan for procuring data, including an expected implementation timeline, from these nongovernmental sources, as appropriate.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The strategy shall include—

(A) an analysis of financial or other benefits to, and risks associated with, acquiring commercial weather data or services, including through multiyear acquisition approaches;

(B) an identification of methods to address planning, programming, budgeting, and execution challenges to such approaches, including—

(i) how standards will be set to ensure that data is reliable and effective;

(ii) how data may be acquired through commercial experimental or innovative tech-

niques and then evaluated for integration into operational use;

(iii) how to guarantee public access to all forecast-critical data to ensure that the American weather industry and the public continue to have access to information critical to their work; and

(iv) in accordance with section 50503 of title 51, United States Code, methods to address potential termination liability or cancellation costs associated with weather data or service contracts; and

(C) an identification of any changes needed in the requirements development and approval processes of the Department of Commerce to facilitate effective and efficient implementation of such strategy.

(3) **AUTHORITY FOR AGREEMENTS.**—The Assistant Administrator for NESDIS may enter into multiyear agreements necessary to carry out the strategy developed under this subsection.

##### (c) **PILOT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **CRITERIA.**—Not later than December 31, 2015, NOAA shall publish data standards and specifications for space-based commercial weather data.

##### (2) **PILOT CONTRACT.**—

(A) **CONTRACT.**—Not later than October 1, 2016, NOAA shall, through an open competition, enter into at least one pilot contract with a private sector entity capable of providing data that meet the standards and specifications set by NOAA to provide commercial weather data in a manner that allows NOAA to calibrate and evaluate the data.

(B) **ASSESSMENT OF DATA VIABILITY.**—Not later than October 1, 2019, NOAA shall transmit to Congress the results of a determination of the extent to which data provided under the contract entered into under subparagraph (A) meet the criteria published under paragraph (1).

(3) **OBTAINING FUTURE DATA.**—NOAA shall, to the extent feasible, obtain commercial weather data from private sector providers.

(4) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated out of funds made available for procurement, acquisition, and construction at NESDIS, \$9,000,000 for carrying out this subsection.

#### SEC. 11. ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION SERVICES WORKING GROUP.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The NOAA Science Advisory Board shall continue to maintain a standing working group named the Environmental Information Services Working Group (in this section referred to as the “Working Group”) to—

(1) provide advice for prioritizing weather research initiatives at NOAA to produce real improvement in weather forecasting;

(2) provide advice on existing or emerging technologies or techniques that can be found in private industry or the research community that could be incorporated into forecasting at NWS to improve forecasting skill;

(3) identify opportunities to improve communications between weather forecasters, Federal, State, local, tribal, and other emergency management personnel, and the public; and to improve communications and partnerships among NOAA and the private and academic sectors; and

(4) address such other matters as the Science Advisory Board requests of the Working Group.

##### (b) **COMPOSITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Working Group shall be composed of leading experts and innovators from all relevant fields of science and engineering including atmospheric chemistry, atmospheric physics, meteorology, hydrology, social science, risk communications, electrical engineering, and computer sciences. In carrying out this sec-

tion, the Working Group may organize into subpanels.

(2) **NUMBER.**—The Working Group shall be composed of no fewer than 15 members. Nominees for the Working Group may be forwarded by the Working Group for approval by the Science Advisory Board. Members of the Working Group may choose a chair (or co-chairs) from among their number with approval by the Science Advisory Board.

(c) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—The Working Group shall transmit annually to the Science Advisory Board for submission to the Under Secretary a report on progress made by NOAA in adopting the Working Group’s recommendations. The Science Advisory Board shall transmit this report to the Under Secretary. Within 30 days of receipt of such report, the Under Secretary shall transmit it to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

#### SEC. 12. INTERAGENCY WEATHER RESEARCH AND INNOVATION COORDINATION.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish an Inter-agency Committee for Advancing Weather Services to improve coordination of relevant weather research and forecast innovation activities across the Federal Government. The Interagency Committee shall—

(1) include participation by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration, NOAA and its constituent elements, the National Science Foundation, and such other agencies involved in weather forecasting research as the President determines are appropriate;

(2) identify and prioritize top forecast needs and coordinate those needs against budget requests and program initiatives across participating offices and agencies; and

(3) share information regarding operational needs and forecasting improvements across relevant agencies.

(b) **CO-CHAIR.**—The Federal Coordinator for Meteorology shall serve as a co-chair of this panel.

(c) **FURTHER COORDINATION.**—The Director shall take such other steps as are necessary to coordinate the activities of the Federal Government with those of the American weather industry, State governments, emergency managers, and academic researchers.

#### SEC. 13. OAR AND NWS EXCHANGE PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Assistant Administrator for OAR and the Assistant Administrator for NWS may establish a program to detail OAR personnel to the NWS and NWS personnel to OAR.

(b) **GOAL.**—The goal of this program is to enhance forecasting innovation through regular, direct interaction between OAR’s world-class scientists and NWS’s operational staff.

(c) **ELEMENTS.**—The program shall allow up to 10 OAR staff and NWS staff to spend up to 1 year on detail. Candidates shall be jointly selected by the Assistant Administrator for OAR and the Assistant Administrator for NWS.

(d) **REPORT.**—The Under Secretary shall report annually to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on participation in such program and shall highlight any innovations that come from this interaction.

#### SEC. 14. VISITING FELLOWS AT NWS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Assistant Administrator for NWS may establish a program to host postdoctoral fellows and academic researchers at any of the National Centers for Environmental Prediction.



(b) **GOAL.**—This program shall be designed to provide direct interaction between forecasters and talented academic and private sector researchers in an effort to bring innovation to forecasting tools and techniques available to the NWS.

(c) **SELECTION AND APPOINTMENT.**—Such fellows shall be competitively selected and appointed for a term not to exceed 1 year.

**SEC. 15. NOAA WEATHER READY ALL HAZARDS AWARD PROGRAM.**

(a) **PROGRAM.**—The Assistant Administrator for NWS is authorized to establish the NOAA Weather Ready All Hazards Award Program. This award program shall provide annual awards to honor individuals or organizations that use or provide NOAA Weather Radio All Hazards receivers or transmitters to save lives and protect property. Individuals or organizations that utilize other early warning tools or applications also qualify for this award.

(b) **GOAL.**—This award program draws attention to the life-saving work of the NOAA Weather Ready All Hazards Program, as well as emerging tools and applications, that provide real-time warning to individuals and communities of severe weather or other hazardous conditions.

(c) **PROGRAM ELEMENTS.**—

(1) **NOMINATIONS.**—Nominations for this award shall be made annually by the Weather Field Offices to the Assistant Administrator for NWS. Broadcast meteorologists, weather radio manufacturers and weather warning tool and application developers, emergency managers and public safety officials may nominate individuals and/or organizations to their local Weather Field Offices, but the final list of award nominees must come from the Weather Field Offices.

(2) **SELECTION OF Awardees.**—Annually, the Assistant Administrator for NWS shall choose winners of this award whose timely actions, based on NOAA weather radio all hazards receivers or transmitters or other early warning tools and applications, saved lives and/or property or demonstrated public service in support of weather or all hazard warnings.

(3) **AWARD CEREMONY.**—The Assistant Administrator for NWS shall establish a means of making these awards to provide maximum public awareness of the importance of NOAA Weather Radio, and such other warning tools and applications as are represented in the awards.

**SEC. 16. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(1) **AOA.**—The term “AOA” means an Analysis of Alternatives.

(2) **NESDIS.**—The term “NESDIS” means the National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service.

(3) **NOAA.**—The term “NOAA” means the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(4) **NWS.**—The term “NWS” means the National Weather Service.

(5) **OAR.**—The term “OAR” means the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research.

(6) **OSE.**—The term “OSE” means an Observing System Experiment.

(7) **OSSE.**—The term “OSSE” means an Observing System Simulation Experiment.

(8) **UNDER SECRETARY.**—The term “Under Secretary” means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

**SEC. 17. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) **FISCAL YEAR 2015.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015—

(1) \$90,800,000 to OAR to carry out this Act, of which—

(A) \$70,000,000 is authorized for weather laboratories and cooperative institutes; and

(B) \$20,800,000 is authorized for weather and air chemistry research programs; and

(2) out of funds made available for research and development at NOAA, an additional amount of \$16,000,000 for OAR to carry out the joint technology transfer initiative described in section 3(b)(4).

(b) **FISCAL YEARS 2016 AND 2017.**—For each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017, there are authorized to be appropriated to OAR—

(1) \$100,000,000 to carry out this Act, of which—

(A) \$80,000,000 is authorized for weather laboratories and cooperative institutes; and

(B) \$20,000,000 is authorized for weather and air chemistry research programs; and

(2) an additional amount of \$20,000,000 for the joint technology transfer initiative described in section 3(b)(4).

(c) **LIMITATION.**—No additional funds are authorized to carry out this Act, and the amendments made by this Act.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1561, the bill now under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), who is the vice chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas, Chairman SMITH, for his continued leadership on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

H.R. 1561, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2015, prioritizes the protection of life and property at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration by focusing research and computing resources on improving weather forecasting, quantitative observing data planning, Next Generation modeling, and an emphasis on research to operations technology transfer.

I echo Chairman SMITH's concerns that severe weather greatly affects large parts of the country, and as a Representative from Oklahoma, I understand the need for improvement firsthand. In 2013, the deadly storms in my home State were a stark reminder that we can do better to predict severe weather events and provide longer lead times to protect Americans in harm's way.

I am proud that this legislation has a dedicated tornado warning improvement Program. The goal of this program is to reduce the loss from tornadoes by advancing the understanding of fundamental meteorological science, allowing detection and notifications that are more accurate, effective, and timely.

Constituents in my home State will benefit greatly from longer tornado warning lead times, which will save lives and better protect property. H.R. 1561 makes clear that NOAA will prioritize weather research and protect lives and property through a focused, affordable, attainable, and forward-looking research plan at the agency's research office.

This bill also helps encourage innovation and new capacities developed through NOAA's Weather Research Program, like creating a joint technology transfer from the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research. This transfer is essential to get new forecasting models and technologies out of the research side of NOAA and into our operational forecast.

This bill directs NOAA to develop plans to restore our country's leadership in weather forecasting. It is no secret that many people in our weather community are distraught that our forecasting capacities have deteriorated in recent years. While other countries are making great strides in weather advancements, Americans are paying the price for lost leadership with their lives and their wallets. This is another reminder that we can do better.

This bill prompts NOAA to actively consider new commercial data and private sector solutions to further enhance our weather forecasting capacities. This legislation includes a pilot program which will provide NOAA a clear and credible demonstration of the valuable data from commercial technologies available today.

This legislation is substantially similar to last year's bipartisan Weather Forecasting Improvement Act, which passed the House by a voice vote. The bill before us today updates authorization numbers to reflect current spending levels, adjusts dates to reflect current operating status, and incorporates minor additions and technical changes to improve the bill's clarity and intent.

This legislation is the result of a bipartisan agreement last year and again this year. I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), the Subcommittee on Environment chairman, for his active leadership on this issue in the last Congress and for getting us here today.

I also want to thank the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Environment, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), for her efforts in crafting a bipartisan agreement and joining in this most worthwhile initiative to save American lives and property through better weather forecasting.

Finally, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act has received numerous letters of support which I would like to mention, including letters from Utah State University, Space Environment Technologies, Metro Weather, Utah Science Technology and Research Initiative.

Once again, it is a good bill. It has been worked on diligently. We need to pass it.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1561, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2015. This bill, introduced by my friend, Mr. LUCAS, builds on the work that subcommittee chairman Mr. BRIDENSTINE and former subcommittee chairman Mr. STEWART and I did in the last Congress.

The language before us today is the result of a truly bipartisan effort with extensive discussions and negotiations across the aisle. Although the bill is not perfect, it is a good bill and a better bill than the one that passed in the last Congress, and I ask all my colleagues to support it.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has many important tasks at the cutting edge of science and service. The agency's responsibilities for weather forecasting are critical to our country.

We are proud of the good work of NOAA and its dedicated employees. They are a committed workforce, responsible for keeping our communities safe during inclement weather.

But with the increasing frequency of severe weather events, there can and should be improvements in weather forecasting. For example, forecasts can be more precise regarding what will happen and when. Forecasts can provide more lead time, especially of severe weather events, to allow people to prepare. Forecast information can be communicated more effectively to the public and those in harm's way so we can reduce the loss of life and property.

This bill is designed to make sure that NOAA achieves these important goals. H.R. 1561 draws upon the model of innovation used by the military services where researchers work hand in hand with those on the front lines to develop innovations that have real-world practical returns.

The bill connects the research side of NOAA, the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, more effectively with the forecasting needs of the National Weather Service. The bill contains several provisions that will improve interactions and information sharing between OAR and NWS. It also establishes new ways for NOAA to hear from and work with the broader research and private weather communities.

NOAA is not the only agency that researches weather or has responsibility for communicating forecast information, so the bill establishes interagency coordination, through the Office of Science and Technology Policy, across the agencies that have these responsibilities. This coordination will leverage our limited resources and more rapidly spread the adoption of best tools and practices across agencies.

H.R. 1561 recognizes that the best forecasts in the world will not fully serve the public's needs unless we have

an effective communications system. The bill directs NOAA to do more research, listen to experts, and improve its risk communication techniques. The bill also reestablishes a program that allows NOAA to make awards to people who save the lives of others through reliance on NOAA's Weather Radio All Hazards program.

This bill also establishes a pilot program at NOAA to look to the commercial sector for weather forecasting data. This is an overdue effort to ensure that Federal dollars are spent effectively and leveraged appropriately.

Additionally, the bill requires NOAA to run simulations of the effect of different configurations of instruments and datasets on forecasting accuracy so the agency can look at the benefits and costs of different arrays of sensors. It is important to make sure that these requirements are not too prescriptive so that NOAA is able to use the most efficient, accurate, and cost-effective model for the situation. I will continue to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle on how we can make these provisions work well.

In summary, the changes in this bill will bring about advances that result in better development and deployment of forecast innovations and technology. Importantly, most of these changes are coming at little or no cost. The bill is focused on changes to internal processes rather than simply spending more money. To the degree that the bill does expand the agency's authorization for weather research, it is done in line with anticipated needs in this area.

Again, I want to thank the Members on both sides of the aisle for their input and support. I am particularly grateful to Ms. JOHNSON for her support during negotiations as well as Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Also, I want to thank the hard-working staff on both sides of the aisle for their efforts to keep coming back to the table and helping to move this forward.

Mr. Chairman, we also received many letters of support for H.R. 1561 from more than 20 different organizations, including the Weather Coalition; the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, which represents more than 100 research institutions; the Global Weather Corporation; the American Weather and Climate Industry Association; the American Commercial Space Weather Association; and many others. Additionally, we received letters of support from a number of individuals who serve on the Environmental Information Services Working Group, which is one of NOAA's scientific advisory bodies.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank the gentlewoman from Oregon for her work on this bill. She has been a strong advocate and an initiator on the benefits that this bill does promote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from

Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Environment of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just echo the comments of my colleague from Oklahoma, the vice chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Mr. LUCAS, and of course the ranking member, Ms. BONAMICI. I think your summation of this bill is right on target.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to attest that H.R. 1561, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act, is the very first step in what will lead us to a day when we have zero deaths from tornadoes. I want to repeat that. This is the very first step of what is necessary to move us to a day where we have zero deaths from tornadoes. Those of us from the great State of Oklahoma understand this all too well.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to first thank Chairman SMITH, Vice Chairman LUCAS, and the Subcommittee on Environment Ranking Member BONAMICI for their tireless efforts to see this bipartisan legislation move forward.

The burgeoning commercial private sector for space-based weather data and aviation-based weather data has voiced its support for this legislation. I would like to mention letters to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology from PlanetiQ, Tempus Global Data, Panasonic Avionics Corporation, GeoOptics, and Spire Global.

H.R. 1561 builds on the foundation laid by my House-passed Weather Forecasting Improvement Act from last Congress and directs NOAA to prioritize activities that will save lives and protect property. This is critically important to my State, which is in the heart of Tornado Alley.

In fact, I just went home for the weekend. Saturday night, about midnight, all of the tornado sirens started going off. My wife and I got up. We got our kids out of bed. We brought them downstairs. We set up their beds in my closet. My wife and I turned on the TV, and we surfed the Internet trying to find out where the tornadoes were and where they were touching down.

This is critically important, and I am sure my experience this weekend, which is not unique to this weekend, is also an experience by many of my constituents and others throughout the State of Oklahoma. We must do all we can to improve our ability to predict the weather.

H.R. 1561 will help NOAA to develop more accurate and timely warnings for not only tornadoes, but also hurricanes and other high-impact weather events. It calls on NOAA to develop a plan to regain and maintain our forecasting capabilities that are second to none in the world because right now we, unfortunately, are lagging behind our counterparts in Europe, the U.K., and Canada. The bill encourages better cooperation across NOAA offices and enhances collaboration with universities such as the University of Oklahoma,

which is a national leader in weather research.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud of a new section in this year's version that we have worked closely with industry, NOAA, and other Members of Congress to include. H.R. 1561 authorizes a pilot program for NOAA to purchase commercial space-based weather data and test it against NOAA's proprietary data. It also calls on NOAA to publish standards it expects from any purchased data from the commercial sector.

Mr. Speaker, this has the potential to be a major paradigm shift provision. This is the first step towards changing the business model. I believe we need to change the business model, moving to a day where the government does not purchase, own, and operate huge monolithic billion-dollar satellites but, rather, utilizes the innovation of the private sector to provide the data necessary to feed our data assimilation systems and our numerical weather models.

□ 1830

This will ultimately allow NOAA to focus its resources on the research and development necessary to improve our modeling capabilities, computing capacity, and warning lead times outlined in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there will come a time when there will be zero deaths from tornados. I think this bill will help us implement the necessary steps to get there.

I, once again, thank my colleagues on the Science Committee for all their hard work, and I look forward to working with our counterparts in the Senate to move this legislation to the President's desk.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1561 has received overwhelming support from the weather enterprise and industry. I would like to mention letters of support from AccuWeather, The Weather Company, Science and Technology Corporation, and Carmel Research Center as well.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD a full list of the 25 letters of support the Science Committee received for this legislation.

LETTERS OF SUPPORT FOR H.R. 1561—THE WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECASTING INNOVATION ACT OF 2015

#### COMPANIES

AccuWeather, American Commercial Space Weather Association, Atmospheric & Space Technology Research Associates, American Weather and Climate Industry Association, Carmel Research Center, GeoOptics, Global Weather Corporation, MetraWeather, Panasonic Avionics Corporation, Planet IQ.

Space Environment Technologies, Spire Global, Science Technology Corporation, Tempus Global Data, The Weather Company, University Corporation of Atmospheric Research, Utah Science Technology and Research Initiative, Utah State University,

Weather Coalition, Weather Decision Technologies.

#### INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION SERVICES WORKING GROUP

Walt Dabbert—Vaisala, Philip Ardanuy—Raytheon, Waren Qualley—Harris, Jean Vieux—Vieux Hydrology, Julie Winkler—Michigan State University.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other request for time, but I just want to thank the three original cosponsors we have on the floor tonight—Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Ms. BONAMICI—for sponsoring such an important piece of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, let me say, again, that this is a good bill that will improve weather forecasting innovation and services.

The results of the changes contained in this legislation? The public will be safer because of more timely and more accurate forecasts that will protect lives and property. We will also be growing our economy and creating jobs through this bill.

Researchers have found that annual variations in weather can produce billions of dollars in reduced U.S. gross domestic product. With stakes that large, we owe it to our Nation to improve weather forecasting.

H.R. 1561 takes intelligent steps to support NOAA and to drive needed change in how we harness research to forecasting needs.

Again, I want to thank the many leaders in the research community and the private weather sector who provided advice to the committee as we worked on this bill. I also want to extend my appreciation to the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, Dr. Kathy Sullivan, for her cooperation and advice.

I will continue working with my colleagues across the aisle and in the other body until we have a good, final bill. Again, I thank my cosponsors, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1561, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2015.

I want to take a moment to acknowledge that getting to where we are today was not easy. This is an update to a bill the House passed two years ago, and we have spent several months in this Congress negotiating over how to rework that legislation.

I want to especially recognize the efforts of Environment Subcommittee Chairman JIM BRIDENSTINE and Ranking Member SUZANNE BONAMICI as well as the bill's sponsor, Mr. LUCAS. Their leadership and commitment has really driven this process forward. Today's bill is a testament to their dedication and represents one very positive step forward on the long and continuous road to improving the American weather forecasting system.

America has some of the most diverse and dangerous weather events of any country. From my home state of Texas, all the way to Maine, hurricanes and tropical storms annually batter our coasts. Likewise, the central por-

tions of our country, from Texas to Illinois are the most tornado prone areas in the entire world.

Unfortunately, all you've had to do over the last few weeks is pick up a newspaper or turn on the television to see the true impact tornadoes can have on American families. To help our citizens cope with these potentially devastating events, we need to have the very best weather forecasting and warning capabilities.

The National Weather Service and the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research at NOAA play a central role in protecting the lives and property of every American.

The bill before us today will help accelerate innovation and the transition of cutting-edge weather research into essential weather forecasting tools and products.

The legislation accomplishes this goal by breaking down the barriers that exist between the weather research community, our nation's forecasters, and the private-sector weather enterprise. Improving collaboration and cooperation within NOAA, but also between the agency and the broader weather community will extend the accuracy and timing of our weather predictions. Such improvements will ultimately save lives and make our communities safer.

Mr. Speaker, the weather is a central part of everyday life and resiliency to severe weather events is an important part of strengthening the nation's economic security. H.R. 1561 will advance our weather forecasting capabilities and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1561, "The Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2015," will greatly improve our severe weather forecasting capabilities. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. LUCAS, the Vice Chairman of the Science Committee, for introducing this bill.

Severe weather routinely affects large portions of the United States. This year we already have seen the devastating effects of tornados across our country, especially in Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Kansas, Alabama, and Mississippi among other states.

The deaths and the damage from severe weather underscore our need for a world-class weather prediction system that helps protect American lives and property.

Unfortunately, our leadership has slipped in severe weather forecasting. European weather models routinely predict America's weather better than we do. We need to make up for lost ground.

H.R. 1561 improves weather observation systems and next generation modeling capabilities.

This bill prioritizes weather research at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA's) research agency. This will improve forecasts and warnings.

It prompts NOAA to actively engage new commercial data and private sector weather solutions through a commercial weather data pilot project.

The bill requires a cost-benefit analyses for the procurement of observing system data.

It increases forecast warning lead times for tornadoes and hurricanes. And it creates a joint technology transfer fund in NOAA's Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research to help speed technologies developed through NOAA's weather research into operation.

The enhanced prediction of major storms is of great importance to protecting the public from injury and loss of property.

In addition to Mr. LUCAS, I also want to thank the Chairman of the Environment Subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and the Environment Subcommittee Ranking Member, the gentlewoman from Oregon, Ms. BONAMICI, for their sponsorship of this bipartisan bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1561, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY LABORATORY MODERNIZATION AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER ACT OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1158) to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, facilitate public-private partnerships, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1158

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Definitions.
- Sec. 3. Savings clause.

### TITLE I—INNOVATION MANAGEMENT AT DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Sec. 101. Technology transfer and transitions assessment.

Sec. 102. Sense of Congress.

Sec. 103. Nuclear energy innovation.

### TITLE II—CROSS-SECTOR PARTNERSHIPS AND GRANT COMPETITIVENESS

Sec. 201. Agreements for Commercializing Technology pilot program.

Sec. 202. Public-private partnerships for commercialization.

Sec. 203. Inclusion of early-stage technology demonstration in authorized technology transfer activities.

Sec. 204. Funding competitiveness for institutions of higher education and other nonprofit institutions.

Sec. 205. Participation in the Innovation Corps program.

### TITLE III—ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT

Sec. 301. Report by Government Accountability Office.

### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **DEPARTMENT.**—The term “Department” means the Department of Energy.

(2) **NATIONAL LABORATORY.**—The term “National Laboratory” means a Department of

Energy nonmilitary national laboratory, including—

- (A) Ames Laboratory;
- (B) Argonne National Laboratory;
- (C) Brookhaven National Laboratory;
- (D) Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory;
- (E) Idaho National Laboratory;
- (F) Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory;
- (G) National Energy Technology Laboratory;
- (H) National Renewable Energy Laboratory;
- (I) Oak Ridge National Laboratory;
- (J) Pacific Northwest National Laboratory;
- (K) Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory;
- (L) Savannah River National Laboratory;
- (M) Stanford Linear Accelerator Center;
- (N) Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility; and

(O) any laboratory operated by the National Nuclear Security Administration, but only with respect to the civilian energy activities thereof.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

### SEC. 3. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act abrogates or otherwise affects the primary responsibilities of any National Laboratory to the Department.

## TITLE I—INNOVATION MANAGEMENT AT DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### SEC. 101. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND TRANSITIONS ASSESSMENT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report which shall include—

(1) an assessment of the Department’s current ability to carry out the goals of section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391), including an assessment of the role and effectiveness of the Director of the Office of Technology Transitions; and

(2) recommended departmental policy changes and legislative changes to section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391) to improve the Department’s ability to successfully transfer new energy technologies to the private sector.

### SEC. 102. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary should encourage the National Laboratories and federally funded research and development centers to inform small businesses of the opportunities and resources that exist pursuant to this Act.

### SEC. 103. NUCLEAR ENERGY INNOVATION.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the National Laboratories, relevant Federal agencies, and other stakeholders, shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report assessing the Department’s capabilities to authorize, host, and oversee privately funded fusion and non-light water reactor prototypes and related demonstration facilities at Department-owned sites. For purposes of this report, the Secretary shall consider the Department’s capabilities to facilitate privately-funded prototypes up to 20 megawatts thermal output. The report shall address the following:

- (1) The Department’s safety review and oversight capabilities.
- (2) Potential sites capable of hosting research, development, and demonstration of prototype reactors and related facilities for the purpose of reducing technical risk.

(3) The Department’s and National Laboratories’ existing physical and technical capabilities relevant to research, development, and oversight.

(4) The efficacy of the Department’s available contractual mechanisms, including cooperative research and development agreements, work for others agreements, and agreements for commercializing technology.

(5) Potential cost structures related to physical security, decommissioning, liability, and other long-term project costs.

(6) Other challenges or considerations identified by the Secretary, including issues related to potential cases of demonstration reactors up to 2 gigawatts of thermal output.

## TITLE II—CROSS-SECTOR PARTNERSHIPS AND GRANT COMPETITIVENESS

### SEC. 201. AGREEMENTS FOR COMMERCIALIZING TECHNOLOGY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out the Agreements for Commercializing Technology pilot program of the Department, as announced by the Secretary on December 8, 2011, in accordance with this section.

(b) **TERMS.**—Each agreement entered into pursuant to the pilot program referred to in subsection (a) shall provide to the contractor of the applicable National Laboratory, to the maximum extent determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, increased authority to negotiate contract terms, such as intellectual property rights, payment structures, performance guarantees, and multiparty collaborations.

(c) **ELIGIBILITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any director of a National Laboratory may enter into an agreement pursuant to the pilot program referred to in subsection (a).

(2) **AGREEMENTS WITH NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.**—To carry out paragraph (1) and subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary shall permit the directors of the National Laboratories to execute agreements with a non-Federal entity, including a non-Federal entity already receiving Federal funding that will be used to support activities under agreements executed pursuant to paragraph (1), provided that such funding is solely used to carry out the purposes of the Federal award.

(3) **RESTRICTION.**—The requirements of chapter 18 of title 35, United States Code (commonly known as the “Bayh-Dole Act”) shall apply if—

(A) the agreement is a funding agreement (as that term is defined in section 201 of that title); and

(B) at least 1 of the parties to the funding agreement is eligible to receive rights under that chapter.

(d) **SUBMISSION TO SECRETARY.**—Each affected director of a National Laboratory shall submit to the Secretary, with respect to each agreement entered into under this section—

(1) a summary of information relating to the relevant project;

(2) the total estimated costs of the project;

(3) estimated commencement and completion dates of the project; and

(4) other documentation determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(e) **CERTIFICATION.**—The Secretary shall require the contractor of the affected National Laboratory to certify that each activity carried out under a project for which an agreement is entered into under this section—

(1) is not in direct competition with the private sector; and

(2) does not present, or minimizes, any apparent conflict of interest, and avoids or neutralizes any actual conflict of interest, as a result of the agreement under this section.

(f) **EXTENSION.**—The pilot program referred to in subsection (a) shall be extended until October 31, 2017.

(g) REPORTS.—

(1) OVERALL ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date described in subsection (f), the Secretary, in coordination with directors of the National Laboratories, shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that—

(A) assesses the overall effectiveness of the pilot program referred to in subsection (a);

(B) identifies opportunities to improve the effectiveness of the pilot program;

(C) assesses the potential for program activities to interfere with the responsibilities of the National Laboratories to the Department; and

(D) provides a recommendation regarding the future of the pilot program.

(2) TRANSPARENCY.—The Secretary, in coordination with directors of the National Laboratories, shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate an annual report that accounts for all incidences of, and provides a justification for, non-Federal entities using funds derived from a Federal contract or award to carry out agreements pursuant to this section.

#### SEC. 202. PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FOR COMMERCIALIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary shall delegate to directors of the National Laboratories signature authority with respect to any agreement described in subsection (b) the total cost of which (including the National Laboratory contributions and project recipient cost share) is less than \$1,000,000, if such an agreement falls within the scope of—

(1) a strategic plan for the National Laboratory that has been approved by the Department; or

(2) the most recent Congressionally approved budget for Department activities to be carried out by the National Laboratory.

(b) AGREEMENTS.—Subsection (a) applies to—

(1) a cooperative research and development agreement;

(2) a non-Federal work-for-others agreement; and

(3) any other agreement determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, in collaboration with the directors of the National Laboratories.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) ACCOUNTABILITY.—The director of the affected National Laboratory and the affected contractor shall carry out an agreement under this section in accordance with applicable policies of the Department, including by ensuring that the agreement does not compromise any national security, economic, or environmental interest of the United States.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The director of the affected National Laboratory and the affected contractor shall certify that each activity carried out under a project for which an agreement is entered into under this section does not present, or minimizes, any apparent conflict of interest, and avoids or neutralizes any actual conflict of interest, as a result of the agreement under this section.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS.—Within 30 days of entering an agreement under this section, the director of a National Laboratory shall submit to the Secretary for monitoring and review all records of the National Laboratory relating to the agreement.

(4) RATES.—The director of a National Laboratory may charge higher rates for services performed under a partnership agreement entered into pursuant to this section, regardless of the full cost of recovery, if such funds are used exclusively to support further re-

search and development activities at the respective National Laboratory.

(d) EXCEPTION.—This section does not apply to any agreement with a majority foreign-owned company.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 12 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting the subparagraphs appropriately;

(B) by striking “Each Federal agency” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each Federal agency”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in accordance with section 202(a) of the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015, approval by the Secretary of Energy shall not be required for any technology transfer agreement proposed to be entered into by a National Laboratory of the Department of Energy, the total cost of which (including the National Laboratory contributions and project recipient cost share) is less than \$1,000,000.”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “subsection (a)(1)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (a)(1)(A)”.

#### SEC. 203. INCLUSION OF EARLY-STAGE TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION IN AUTHORIZED TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER ACTIVITIES.

Section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391) is amended by—

(1) redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) EARLY-STAGE TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION.—The Secretary shall permit the directors of the National Laboratories to use funds authorized to support technology transfer within the Department to carry out early-stage and pre-commercial technology demonstration activities to remove technology barriers that limit private sector interest and demonstrate potential commercial applications of any research and technologies arising from National Laboratory activities.”.

#### SEC. 204. FUNDING COMPETITIVENESS FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OTHER NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS.

Section 988(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16352(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3)” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) EXEMPTION FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OTHER NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a research or development activity performed by an institution of higher education or nonprofit institution (as defined in section 4 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3703)).

“(B) TERMINATION DATE.—The exemption under subparagraph (A) shall apply during the 6-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this paragraph.”.

#### SEC. 205. PARTICIPATION IN THE INNOVATION CORPS PROGRAM.

The Secretary may enter into an agreement with the Director of the National Science Foundation to enable researchers funded by the Department to participate in the National Science Foundation Innovation Corps program.

### TITLE III—ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT

#### SEC. 301. REPORT BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report—

(1) describing the results of the projects developed under sections 201, 202, and 203, including information regarding—

(A) partnerships initiated as a result of those projects and the potential linkages presented by those partnerships with respect to national priorities and other taxpayer-funded research; and

(B) whether the activities carried out under those projects result in—

(i) fiscal savings;

(ii) expansion of National Laboratory capabilities;

(iii) increased efficiency of technology transfers; or

(iv) an increase in general efficiency of the National Laboratory system; and

(2) assess the scale, scope, efficacy, and impact of the Department's efforts to promote technology transfer and private sector engagement at the National Laboratories, and make recommendations on how the Department can improve these activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1158, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015, enables the Department of Energy to better form partnerships with non-Federal entities and transfer research to the private sector.

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) for his initiative on this issue and the gentleman from Colorado, Representative ED PERLMUTTER, for cosponsoring this important piece of legislation as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, before I get started, we also have several letters of support on this that I would submit for the RECORD. One is from the Bipartisan Policy Center on behalf of the American Energy Innovation Council; another is from Third Way. They support this bill. The final one is from the American Nuclear Society.

BIPARTISAN POLICY CENTER,  
March 24, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,  
H-232 of the Capitol, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, H-  
204 of the Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the American Energy Innovation Council (AEIC), we write to urge the prompt consideration of H.R. 1158 Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act. Similar legislation (H.R. 5120) easily passed the House during the last Congress. The bill enjoys strong bipartisan support and was co-sponsored by both Chairman Lamar Smith (R-TX) and Ranking Member Eddie Bernice Johnson (D-TX) of the Committee on Science, Space and Technology.

The AEIC is a group of America's top business executives who came together starting in 2010 to recommend ways to promote American innovation in clean energy technology. We are united in our belief that technology innovation—especially in energy—is at the heart of many of the central economic, national security, competitiveness, and environmental challenges facing our nation. We believe strong support for robust, public investments in energy innovation is critical to a vibrant American economy.

H.R. 1158 gives the National Labs needed flexibility to enter into more effective partnerships with businesses and universities, particularly with respect to early-stage technology demonstration. We anticipate that H.R. 1158 will unlock more private investment in clean energy technology R&D, and we endorse this bill.

Accelerating technology innovation is a smart investment for America's future. We look forward to working with you to once again secure House passage of this important legislation.

Sincerely,

CHAD HOLLIDAY,  
Co-Chair, American  
Energy Innovation  
Council.

NORM AUGUSTINE,  
Co-Chair, American  
Energy Innovation  
Council.

THIRD WAY,  
March 9, 2015.

Hon. RANDY HULTGREN,  
Member, House Committee on Science, Space,  
and Technology, Rayburn House Office  
Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. ED PERLMUTTER,  
Member, House Committee on Science, Space,  
and Technology, Longworth House Office  
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HULTGREN AND CONGRESSMAN PERLMUTTER, we write in support of H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy (DOE) Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015. It is critical that the United States maximizes the ability of our national labs to partner with the private sector to develop and commercialize new energy technologies, particularly around advanced nuclear power. Your bipartisan bill, which has been approved by the Committee and sent to the House, will begin a vital assessment of the labs' capabilities and offer ways to get the best return on taxpayers' investment in energy innovation.

The world faces a profound paradox: ever-increasing global energy demand and the need to dramatically reduce carbon emissions. That's why Third Way strongly believes that the development of advanced nuclear reactors is critical. With dozens of reactor projects underway in the United

States, this country has the opportunity to create enormous economic, national security, and environmental benefits if we can provide the right platform for private companies to develop and commercialize these advanced nuclear technologies. Public-private partnerships of the type envisioned in your legislation can help industry to transcend some of the technological and regulatory barriers it faces and bring this promising energy source to market.

We applaud your leadership in the sponsorship of this bill. There is pent-up demand in the private sector to work with the national labs to develop innovative advanced nuclear, carbon capture, and other energy solutions. H.R. 1158 is a very important step to ensure that happens. We look forward to supporting it as it moves through the House and Senate.

Sincerely,

JOSH FREED,  
Vice President for the Clean Energy Program.

AMERICAN NUCLEAR SOCIETY,  
La Grange Park, IL, March 23, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,  
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space & Tech-  
nology, House of Representatives, Wash-  
ington, DC.

Hon. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,  
Ranking Member, Committee on Science, Space  
& Technology, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MEMBER JOHNSON: I write on behalf of the 11,000 members of the American Nuclear Society to express our support for H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015.

We appreciate your efforts to harness the intellectual assets of our national laboratories through broader technology commercialization and public-private partnership initiatives. We are especially grateful for Section 104 which directs the Department of Energy to assess its ability to "incubate" privately-funded advanced research and test reactor prototypes at national laboratories.

ANS strongly supports expanded federal engagement in advanced, non-light water nuclear research and development. It is becoming increasingly clear that the U.S. and the world will need to significantly expand its nuclear generating capacity in the coming decades to address growing energy demands while reducing harmful emissions.

Historically, the U.S. led the world in developing new reactor technology. However, several other nations, including Russia and China, have moved aggressively to develop so-called Generation IV reactors which offer distinct advantages over their light water counterparts. As such, the U.S. must recommit itself to improving its advanced reactor technology portfolio in order to maintain its influence over global nuclear safety and non-proliferation norms. This legislation, if enacted, would provide needed support toward that objective.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL BRADY RAAP,  
President, American Nuclear Society.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman, Mr. SMITH, as well as the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) for helping bring this legislation to the floor again this Congress.

H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act, ensures that the Department of Energy has the tools it needs to allow new startups, small businesses, universities, and the general public at large to do what they do best: react to market signals and innovate.

The Federal Government and the national labs play a vital role doing the basic research needed to maintain America's position as a safe and innovative nation. Their ability to build large research tools at our user facilities is the crown jewel in our Nation's research capabilities. This is the model other nations, like China, are copying.

Far too often, however, the discoveries made in our labs get stuck in the labs. This is due to a number of reasons, and this bill seeks to break down some of the barriers that make this happen.

Many of these problems are also outlined in chapter three of the "Interim Report of the Commission to Review the Effectiveness of the National Energy Laboratories."

I quote from the report: "Over 50 prior studies and reports published over the past 40 years detail shortcomings in the relationship between the DOE and its laboratories."

It continues:

They present a strikingly consistent pattern of criticism and recommendations for improvement.

The committee and I have reviewed many of these prior reports, and this bill attempts to act on a few of these consistent, noncontroversial recommendations.

By extending the pilot for ACT agreements within DOE, the labs are given the ability to negotiate more flexible contracts with non-Federal entities that would like to take the labs' research and turn it into viable products.

Section 201 in the bill also allows researchers using Federal funds to enter into these agreements, so long as any Federal funds are used exclusively for their intended research purposes.

Section 203 of the bill will continue to chip away at what many call the valley of death, what many startups never make it through because they cannot prove their concept.

This section would allow DOE to use their tech transfer funds for early-stage, precommercial proof of concept demonstrations so the private sector can finally pick up technologies and develop them with private funds. This legislation would also grant to the directors of national labs the signature authority for many agreements with non-Federal entities.

These are decisions that the Secretary of Energy must make under current law, meaning decisions a lab director can make over a phone call in the course of a day must weave their way through the agency's bureaucracy before it lands on the Secretary's desk.

This bill also seeks to improve the Department's relationship with small businesses that can take part in the SBIR-STTR program, and it encourages the Secretary to enter into agreement with the I-Corps program at NSF.

While I do understand that DOE has begun a similar pilot, called Lab Corps, I am worried that this pilot housed in EERE is so narrow in focus that it will



not be applicable for most of our labs' advancement. An accelerator technology being developed for medical treatments, for instance, would not be able to access the current pilot.

Section 103 of this legislation will also require DOE to undertake an honest assessment of its capabilities to authorize, host, and oversee prototype reactors at DOE sites. This is a critical issue for the United States' position as a nuclear technology leader. The United States has not hosted a new research reactor in decades, and there are not any current applications under review at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Unfortunately, the U.S. has become so risk averse that we have regulated ourselves out of business for building the concept reactors that might some day lead to commercially deployable, safer, and more efficient nuclear technologies. We are driving companies overseas. I look forward to seeing the results of this report from DOE.

Our national labs have been at the cutting edge of technological development, and we must always ensure that it is in the national interest. This bill helps to ensure that is the case because a discovery lost in the labs is a discovery wasted.

That is why I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015.

I would like to thank Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working together to produce a strong bipartisan bill. I would like to thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON for getting this bill through committee and to the floor here tonight.

DOE's national labs are responsible for some of the greatest research being conducted in the world, both basic and applied. Some of this research has great potential to become new commercial technologies if our labs provide the type of support that increases the likelihood of technology transfer.

This could have enormous beneficial impacts for our Nation, not just in new technologies, but by making the most of our investments at these labs. That is why improving technology transfer from American research facilities, both national labs and universities, has been one of my top priorities on the Science Committee for the past decade.

H.R. 1158 ensures that our national labs have the resources needed to facilitate the transfer of new technologies to the private sector. It greatly increases the breadth of companies that are eligible to engage in a new pilot program that provides for more flexible partnerships, similar to those in the private sector, and lengthens the program for 2 years. This was an important issue that came up at a hearing 2 years ago, and I am happy that we are getting that done in this bill.

This bill also empowers labs to utilize technology transfer funds on projects that demonstrate commercial applications for their research and technologies, and it asks the Department of Energy for a report on activities related to the congressionally mandated technology commercialization fund which the Department is implementing through the newly formed Office of Technology Transitions.

I personally asked Secretary Moniz about past use of this fund, and so I am pleased by the recent actions of DOE in the direction of the TCF at this time. This bill has impacts beyond labs as well. It would significantly decrease financial obstacles that prevent nonprofit research organizations, including many universities, from working with the Department.

The bill includes language that I wrote that would make the National Science Foundation's highly successful Innovation Corps Program, which pairs up grant recipients with motivated entrepreneurs to help get their ideas in the commercial arena, available to the DOE through a partnership with the NSF.

Finally, the bill ensures that effective reporting and accountability systems are in place so we are able to clearly determine the performance of these new tools, as well as any further steps that will need to be taken.

Mr. Speaker, the innovations that have come out of DOE's national laboratories and research programs are second to none. Argonne National Lab, which is located in my district, is one of the best.

All these federally funded institutions and initiatives have been a critical component of our knowledge-based economy, and this bill will ensure that they not only continue, but they improve their incredible track record.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have no other requests for time on this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

□ 1845

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. LIPINSKI for his work on this bill and for yielding me this time.

I rise today to support H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act. I want to thank my friend from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) for sponsoring this bill and working with me and our colleagues on this important piece of legislation.

This legislation provides tools to spur and accelerate the transfer of new technologies developed at our national labs. It extends the Agreements for Commercializing Technology, or ACT, pilot program for 2 more years and also significantly broadens the range of

companies able to participate in the program, allowing for more flexible partnership agreements.

The bill will allow labs to use their technology to transfer funds for activities which identify and demonstrate commercial opportunities for their research and technologies.

This legislation also removes burdens which currently prevent many universities and other nonprofit research institutions from working with the Department of Energy. This will encourage further collaboration between university researchers across the country and our wealth of knowledge at the national labs.

Mr. Speaker, I represent Golden, Colorado, and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Quite simply, NREL is the premier energy efficiency and renewable energy lab in the world. For more than 40 years, NREL has led the charge in research and design of renewable energy products directly affecting the way we utilize and secure American energy.

This bill will help provide labs like NREL with important tools so they can best lead our country's research on renewable and sustainable forms of energy and transportation and, ultimately, bring these life-changing innovations to consumers. I have seen the great work being done at NREL, and I know this great work is happening at other national labs all across the country.

Last year, DOE signed an agreement for commercializing technology with the Wells Fargo Foundation to utilize NREL and other DOE national labs to further research in energy-efficient buildings-related technologies, and this bill allows that agreement to be extended for at least 2 more years.

DOE's 17 national laboratories and research programs have been the birthplace to some of our most revolutionary technologies. When this research is harnessed by entrepreneurs and business leaders, startups with one or two employees can grow into companies employing dozens, if not hundreds, of people.

We want to make sure these federally funded institutions and initiatives remain an important foundation of our knowledge-based economy. That is why I am proud to cosponsor this bipartisan legislation with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), giving scientists and researchers in both the public and private sector tools and freedom they need to unlock a new wave of innovation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. PERLMUTTER for their leadership on this important issue.

This bill helps foster opportunities for entrepreneurs to more easily access technologies coming out of the Department of Energy and connect the brilliant minds to the equally brilliant



minds in the private sector who can then commercialize this technology.

Federal R&D is responsible for many of the industries and technologies that now drive our national wealth—the most earth-shattering example, the Internet, developed by government scientists at DARPA.

Federal research spawned the biotech and semiconductor industries; gave us tools like the laser, GPS, and MRI; and, through the World Wide Web and the Internet, has entirely changed the way we find a restaurant, talk to our children, and sell cars.

The role of the private sector in developing technology is vital, and government must lead the way in innovation, providing the patient capital necessary to perform research without any known commercial application or concern for profit.

I am reminded of the fascinating idea that mathematicians who develop things in their heads, in their offices, with no application to anything, so often, within weeks, will find that that mathematical new idea applies to real-life situations.

Einstein marveled at the power of pure mathematics, and he said, “How can it be that mathematics, being after all a product of human thought which is independent of experience, is so admirably appropriate to the objects of reality?”

In 1959, the physicist Eugene Wigner described this problem as “the unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics.”

H.R. 1158 helps bring these pieces together, mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and technology; and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Thank you, Chairman SMITH, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, before I wrap up on the bill we are debating right now, I just wanted to thank Chairman SMITH for his work on this, along with Ranking Member JOHNSON. Working together, we were able to get these bills done here on the floor tonight.

I know that tomorrow we will have a little bit more of a contentious debate on a bill coming out of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee; but I just wanted to, again, commend the chairman and Ranking Member JOHNSON for our work together on these bills.

We know there are important things that we can get done and we need to get done and will be very helpful to our Nation, and I am glad that we were able to do those things on these bills that we have brought forward here tonight, a good bipartisan mix of bills showing bipartisan cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by asking my colleagues to support H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act.

I want to thank Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. PERLMUTTER for their work on this bill. I think there are many things that we can't even see right now that will come out of this, but I am certain that our national labs and the great value that they are to our Nation will continue, and this will allow them to continue to not only do their research, but to do an even better job of producing new technologies that will be a great benefit to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015, enables the Department of Energy (DOE) to better form partnerships with non-federal entities and transfer research to the private sector.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois, Rep. RANDY HULTGREN, for his initiative on this issue, and the gentleman from Colorado, Rep. ED PERLMUTTER, for it cosponsoring this important legislation.

The Department of Energy is the largest federal supporter of basic research and development and sponsors 47 percent of federal basic research in the physical sciences.

The Department's science and energy research is conducted at over 300 sites nationwide. More than 31,000 researchers take advantage of DOE user facilities each year.

This includes the Department's 17 National Labs, which provide the foundation for the Department of Energy's research and development infrastructure.

These labs keep America at the forefront of global technological capabilities. They ensure that we continue to conduct critical research in high energy physics, advanced scientific computing, biological and environmental research, nuclear physics, fusion energy sciences, basic energy sciences, and applied energy research and development in fossil, nuclear and renewable energy.

The innovative early stage research performed at the labs can have great value for the private sector, but often goes unnoticed.

Because of a communication gap between the labs and the private sector, ideas and technology are often slow to reach the market. And federal government red tape discourages the private sector from using the unique state-of-the-art facilities the national labs offer.

This bill grants lab directors signature authority for agreements with private sector entities valued at less than \$1 million. And it extends a pilot program that allows for more flexible contract terms between companies and lab operators.

This bill also requires DOE to assess its capability to authorize, host, and oversee privately funded fusion research and next generation fission reactor prototypes.

Due to regulatory uncertainty from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the private sector currently has little incentive or ability to build reactor prototypes.

This legislation represents a bipartisan, bicameral agreement to modernize and increase the productivity of the DOE national lab system.

I again thank Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. PERLMUTTER for their initiative on this issue and encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1158, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2262, SPURRING PRIVATE AEROSPACE COMPETITIVENESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 880, AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MAY 22, 2015, THROUGH MAY 29, 2015

Mr. STIVERS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-127) on the resolution (H. Res. 273) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2262) to facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 880) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and providing for proceedings during the period from May 22, 2015, through May 29, 2015, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1335, STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES AND INCREASING FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr. STIVERS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-128) on the resolution (H. Res. 274) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1335) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

#### VIRGINIA TASK FORCE 1

(Mrs. COMSTOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to thank the brave men and

women of Virginia Task Force 1, a domestic and international disaster response resource sponsored by the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department.

I was honored to welcome these miracle workers home this past Saturday morning after their 3-week deployment to Nepal.

Virginia Task Force 1, in partnership with USAID, is always at the ready to answer the call when tragedy or natural disaster strikes, either at home or abroad. Nepal was devastated by two major earthquakes, resulting in the loss of over 8,500 lives, and Virginia Task Force 1 was there to help.

With their incredible skill and teamwork, they were able to rescue a 15-year-old boy trapped in the rubble for 5 days. When the second earthquake hit, they saved a 41-year-old woman who was trapped in a four-story building. They also medically treated countless others.

When they returned home on Saturday morning, they were enthusiastically greeted by their relatives and families. Those families also endure countless hours of worry while their family members and loved ones are halfway around the world in unfamiliar and dangerous circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of Virginia Task Force 1 are truly fabulous and wonderful ambassadors for the Commonwealth of Virginia and our country, and it is an honor and a privilege to thank them for their courageous service to the people of Nepal and to the work they do every day in our country.

#### MANDATED FIXED WHEELCHAIR LIFTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to do a budget presentation in a couple of moments, but I wanted to actually come up here and, with my good friend from South Carolina, MICK MULVANEY, talk about a little article that popped up in *The Economist* last week, and there is the issue.

This place has fairly short memories, but about 2 years ago, there were a handful of us coming here and talking about sort of an esoteric issue, something called—what is it—wheelchair lifts.

For those of us who represent resort areas, I am blessed to represent the community of Scottsdale, a wonderful area. I had one of my resort owners call me, and in a fairly gruff voice, saying: “David, do you know what the Justice Department is doing to me? I have seven pools and Jacuzzis, and apparently, I have to put permanent fixed wheelchair lifts at every pool and Jacuzzi.”

He said: “I want to be sensitive and caring to my mobility-challenged guests.”

He went on to tell me the story that for 10 years, he had had a portable wheelchair lift, and it had never been requested. Here we are, 2 years later. He has torn up his landscaping; he has put in the units. Guess what is now happening?

He has called me and told me that now his insurance rates are starting to really bounce up because of unattractive nuisance. The very things MICK MULVANEY predicted, I like to say I predicted 2 years ago, are coming true.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY). Tell us the other side of the story of what is going on.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. SCHWEIKERT, thank you for the opportunity to talk about this a little bit without the pressures of the 2-minute timer or a 3-minute timer, actually talk about something in detail for a change in this House because it merits the discussion.

My experience with it, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, was exactly the same as yours—they are not exactly the same. I am not from the resort part of South Carolina. Mr. SANFORD and Mr. RICE get that. I am from the more rural inland part of the State; but we have got a lot of freeways and a lot of small businesses operating hotels, a lot of them owned by Asian Americans.

I was approached by a group of Indian American hotel owners last year. These are folks, mom-and-pop operations, that might own one hotel, they might own two. They told me the same story you just told about these pool lifts having to go in.

A lot of them, like your friends with the resorts, had the portable lifts, so if anybody ever asked for help getting into and out of a pool by themselves, they had the ability to do that. Of course, similar to your story, none of them had ever been asked.

The Department of Justice came in and said: You know what, we are going to require you, under the terms of the Americans with Disabilities Act, to put these fixed pool lifts in every single body of water that you have; so if you have a regular size pool, a kiddie pool, and a hot tub, that is three of these fixed lifts.

It was a tremendous burden on these small businesses who, as you mentioned, wanted to help folks who needed help in getting in and out of the pool, but just wanted to do it with a portable machine, as opposed to a standard machine.

□ 1900

They came in, and they said: Look, Mr. MULVANEY, we have seen this act before. This is how we got rid of diving boards. This is why we don't have any diving boards.

Years ago, people said they were an attractive nuisance. Kids were jumping off of them and hurting themselves, so now that entire generation of Americans has grown up without diving boards.

What is going to happen now is that the next generation of Americans is

going to grow up without swimming pools at hotels for the exact reason that you have just mentioned.

We spent 40 years getting rid of these things that children could climb up on and jump off of into the pool, and now the Department of Justice has required these hotel owners to come in and put the exact same thing back in.

It is no longer a diving board. Now it is a mechanical chair. But to an 8-year-old, it looks like something to climb up and jump off of. So they were lamenting the fact not only that their business is going to be hurt but that part of the enjoyment of coming to the hotel would be gone and not available to their customers, and that eventually, you would see them start filling in their swimming pools. Unfortunately, I think that is the way that we are moving.

But they also talked about something—and this is to the point of the article that you just mentioned, *The Economist* from April 25, which is that there was a private right of action in the regulations that came forward. And what this means, to folks who aren't familiar with what that means, is that anybody can sue. In fact, in the United States of America, when anybody can sue, typically, anybody does sue.

The article goes into great length about one very, very energetic plaintiff who filed 529 lawsuits against small-business owners at hotels throughout the southeast. In fact, in one particular period of time, they hit 50 hotels in a row shortly after the regulation became effective so that they could file their lawsuit against the hotel owners.

I will read one of my favorite passages in the article, which is something that should be enlightening for all of us: “There is evidence that lawyers explicitly target small businesses, which are more likely to pay up without a fight.”

There we go. That is what we have done in the name of helping people whom folks were already trying to help. But in the name of having the government tell small business and large business how to help people, what do we end up with? Essentially a jobs bill for the plaintiff's bar.

Before we started today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and I were talking about why we were going to take a few minutes to talk about this.

As my friend from Massachusetts, Barney Frank, said before he left: “Everybody always says, ‘I hate to say I told you so,’ but the truth of the matter is, people love saying, ‘I told you so.’”

This is exactly what we said would happen. And why the Department of Justice saw fit to single out small business hoteliers who were already trying to help people and say, You know what, we know better than you how to help people. You think these portable units are good? Well, we think the fixed units are better. And trust us because we are from the government, and we are here to help you.

What do we end up with as a result of the government trying to fix the problem? We end up with small businesses making less money. And I know not a lot of people are sympathetic to that. I certainly am. I used to be a small-business person. And believe me, the people who worked for me liked it when I made money. So did I. But I recognize the fact that a lot of people are not sympathetic to small business. But small business makes less money.

Kids are going to have less access to swimming pools as they travel the country. Think about that for a second. How absurd is that, that we are going to end up filling in swimming pools in order to prevent lawsuits.

And then lastly, and the worst is, you will end up with a situation where all we have done is empower a small group of overzealous trial lawyers and their plaintiffs.

It is a sad story but one that we hear again and again in America. And I only hope that the next time the government comes up with an idea like this on how to fix things, they will look to what is happening now to the small-business hotel owners as an example of government gone wrong.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I remember you and I having this conversation on the floor and particularly Members from the left coming to the microphone and basically scolding me on how insensitive I was.

Now I realize that my father may have been right about something. He said: "It is almost always about the money."

When you look at The Economist article, you start to realize that this was a jobs act for the Democrat supporters and the trial bar because they are running up and down our communities, suing small businesses.

And I believe you are absolutely correct: our future will be hotels and resorts without pools at all.

Once again, the folks in the opposition questioned our sensitivity, our love for our brothers and sisters. And we were trying to say, This is the economic argument, and here is the litigious argument. And we lost.

The administration basically gave into the trial bar, and now we do have the "I told you so."

Mr. MULVANEY. I would suggest to you, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, that you were, in fact, being insensitive: you were being insensitive to the trial bar.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Darn it. I knew I was doing something wrong.

Mr. MULVANEY. Listen, I had the same experience as you did, Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I was in the Longworth House Office Building a couple years back. You and I wrote a bill together to try to either delay or prevent the DOJ from putting this regulation into effect, and we had people literally protesting outside of our office, folks from the disability community who wanted this particular accommodation. And I am completely sympathetic to that.

What I think they failed to see at the time and failed to grasp was, number

one, they were already being accommodated. My guess is that 99.9 percent of the people who came to protest had never asked to use one of these portable lifts at hoteliers, so they were not aware of the fact that they were there but, at the same time, they never gave any thought to the unintended consequences of this particular piece of regulation that the DOJ promulgated. And I think that, again, is a lesson to be learned.

A government that is big enough to give you everything that you want is big enough to take from you everything that you have. And this, in a very small way, is what we saw in the promulgation of this particular regulation.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. The closing thought on this colloquy:

We are already seeing the insurance world starting to charge higher and higher and higher fees for apartments, hotels, resorts that have these lifts, these permanent platforms. It is because they are already modeling the risk that someone—hopefully not with alcohol involved—but someone is going to crawl up on top of one and jump in. The same litigation profile that removed diving boards 20, 30 years ago, the other side basically has driven us to. And they are going to be our brothers and sisters out there. There are going to be some that are going to be hurt, maybe hurt severely, and ultimately, what is our future? The removal of the swimming pools.

We have got to thank the folks on the left that weren't willing to discuss rational economics and the DOJ, once again, for making a bunch of money for their trial bar friends.

Mr. MULVANEY. We will get equality, Mr. SCHWEIKERT. We will have equal access to the swimming pools under this regulation because no one will have the access. That will be the ultimate result here.

In an effort to make it accessible to everybody, we will end up making it accessible to no one, and in the final analysis, that is a sad state of equality that I don't think anybody should applaud.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. This is not a petty little issue. This is just a simple example that we talk about here almost every day of the runaway arrogance of Washington believing they are going to run our businesses, run our lives, and sort of the obvious outcomes that turn out to be fairly disastrous.

So, Mr. MULVANEY, I appreciate you coming down and giving us some of your time.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. SCHWEIKERT, thank you for the opportunity.

#### THE BUDGET

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to set up here in a second. I am going to actually walk through something we have been working on in our office now for the last month, and that is, what is really going on in budget numbers.

We did a budget town hall about 2 weeks ago in Scottsdale. And I always

like to start it with a simple question that says, How many of you are tired of seeing us in Congress fight with each other? And the hands always go up, and they say, Yes, you have to stop fighting with each other.

And I always try to make the point: it is about the money. You need to understand how bad the underlying financial data is and what is really going on in the scale of debt and deficits and just the sheer scale of spending but also where that spending is going because we have so many of my brothers and sisters here, we go out and campaign and say things like: We are going to take care of waste and fraud. We are going to take care of this and foreign aid. We are going to do this and that. And they are not providing an honest picture of where the money is and where it actually goes.

So we are going to do about 10 of these boards. I know it is going to get technical.

When you run for Congress, one of the first things that happens, if you are a numbers guy, the pollster and the consultants sit you down and say, You can't use big numbers. People won't understand them.

In this presentation, I am going to treat everyone like adults—these aren't Republican numbers; they are not even Democrat numbers, though the majority of these slides actually do come from the White House—to understand what is actually underlying in the data and how quickly it is eroding.

Two points of reference: For decades, we used to talk about how we were going to hit this inflection point when baby boomers began moving into retirement and what was going to happen to the debt curve and what was going to happen to the curve of consumption of the entitlements.

Guess what. We are now well into that inflection point. It has begun, and Congress has done very, very, very little in regards to mandatory spending. You are going to see on these boards that that is actually what may take us down as a Republic.

So this is 2010. Let's just do this as a reference. And remember, 2010 was a year when there was still lots of stimulus money, lots of other spending out there.

You see the blue. The blue is what we refer to as mandatory spending. It is primarily Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, some transfer programs, interest, veterans, and the new health care law.

Okay. In 2010, about 63 percent of our spending was in that blue area; 37 percent was what we call discretionary. That is what we get to vote on here because what is in the blue is in formulas.

I have been here a little over 4 years. I have really had absolutely no influence on that blue area. It is a formula. You hit a certain age, you get a certain benefit.

But I want you to watch what is happening in that entitlement, in that

mandatory spending. And, yes, this is the very discussion that gets people unelected because people get very upset, but we have to have an adult conversation of what is really going on here.

So we are going to do a couple of these slides just to sort of create a reference.

Here is where we are this year. And you remember, on that slide, I think the blue area was about 63 percent of our total spending. This year, it is 69 percent of our total spending. And obviously then the discretionary, what we get to vote on as Members, has now gone down to 31 percent.

Do you notice the movement? And that is just in the last 5 years.

So where are we going? Well, right now, to give you a different way of looking at this, this is our 2015 modeling from the White House. This green area is our revenues. That is the total revenues coming into your Federal Government. That purple area is our debt. That is what we are going to borrow this year to make up for our shortfalls, though you will be happy to know that, as of about 48 hours ago, the administration changed the debt number from \$576 billion for the 2015 fiscal year to—now it is going to be \$582.5 billion. This continues to erode.

We are going to talk about that at the end here, what is actually going on in GDP, on economic growth in this country. And if we do not develop a growth-oriented agenda, we can't meet our obligations. We cannot keep those promises we have made.

And with that, I stand here in shock of how often we engage in these debates, and it is not a growth-oriented focus.

So one thing on this slide I really want you to get: blue over here is mandatory spending. The red is discretionary, with defense. Defense is considered discretionary. We have to borrow either every dime of defense or every dime of everything else, other than defense and mandatory or discretionary—Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, and the new health care law.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, we have to borrow either every dime of defense or every dime of discretionary other than defense, and that is in this year's budget. That is how quickly this is moving away from us.

So what happens if we look way off into the future, like 4 years from now? 2020 is only 4 years from now. When I first got elected in 2011, I did a presentation here. The numbers I am going to show you that happen in 4 years were not supposed to happen until 9 years from now. This is to give you an idea of how quickly the numbers are eroding. Yet I hear almost no one talking about it.

So we are going to be working on that budget in 4 years. Do you remem-

ber that 2010 slide? Sixty-three percent of our spending went to Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, and the new healthcare law. Well, it is going to be 76 percent—76—three-quarters of all of our spending. We are only going to be voting on 24 percent of the budget, and half of that will be defense.

I don't know if anyone knows, because these numbers are small and it is hard to watch, what we will be spending in 2020 on discretionary. So defense and all the litany of programs you think of are basically going to be almost identical to what we were spending 10 years earlier. I will hold that up as one of the successes of the Republican House. We have been very disciplined on spending on what we had the ability to influence, which was the discretionary budget, but the formulaic portion of our budget, entitlements, continues to explode. It is almost as if Washington, D.C., did not know that there was a baby boom, did not know people were going to be turning 65, did not know that 76 million of our brothers and sisters were born in about an 18-year period of time, and now we are into the third year of baby boomers beginning to retire, and that inflection has begun.

So just as a reference, because I often get asked for this slide—and we are putting these slides up on our Web site—there is the spending pie chart for this year. You will see the blue area is all the way to here: Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, the transfer programs also including the new healthcare law, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits.

Two weeks ago when we were doing a budget presentation in my hometown of Scottsdale-Phoenix, I had one woman who was absolutely positive, if we would cut foreign aid, we would be just fine here. It is important to understand. Do you see this little red area here? Foreign aid would be ultimately nothing but a small sliver within that. Yes, it is something, but in many ways, it is theater.

If you have a politician standing in front of you and they are not talking about the mandatory spending and the speed of its growth, you are not having an honest budget discussion. It is hard because in many places around the country, when you stand behind a microphone and hold up these boards and start to say that we need to have an honest conversation about the math underlying Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and what is going to happen on interest on the debt, the new healthcare law and its cost projections blowing through the ceiling, and veterans' benefits, often those Members who have tried to have that conversation get unelected.

But if you have someone walk in to our door here and say, "David, we so desperately need new spending on this," we often pull out our charts and say, "You are absolutely right. This would be wonderful. Do you have a so-

lution to help me refine and deal with and manage the explosion of the cost in Medicare?" And they just stare at you like we are not allowed to talk about that. But that is what is going on here.

So let's do another slide to just sort of see how the numbers really are exploding. If I came to you and said, hey, in 4 years, that 3.8—and it is actually a \$3.75 billion budget we are going to have this year. So 3.756 trillion—sorry, not billion, trillion. So we are going to spend \$3.8 trillion this year. In 4 years, we are going to be spending an additional \$1 trillion on top of that, an additional trillion, and every dime of that is going into mandatory spending. It is not going into health research; it is not going into new parts; it is not going into building a new aircraft carrier; and it is not going into all these programs that we all talk about because it is easy politics. Every dime of that additional trillion dollars in 4 years from now will be in Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, and the new healthcare law.

How many times have you heard that? This is right in front of us. This is what is going on. Your government is growing at an exponential pace, but it is not in the area where we, as Members of Congress, get to vote because it is in the formula areas, the mandatory spending.

Are you starting to see a theme in this discussion and on the slides? I am trying to build an understanding out there with both my brothers and sisters here in Congress and the public out there that if we are not willing to have honest conversations, particularly with this coming Presidential election, about entitlements, mandatory spending, and ways we can manage them—and it is not cuts, but there are much better ways we can deliver these.

You put all the programs, all the promises we have made at risk because just pretending everything is going to be fine means you are basically dooming them to a really ugly future, or the country to an ugly future. So, Mr. Speaker, this gives you an interesting projection.

Now, if we go beyond that 2020 slide, if we go 9 years out—9 years out—we will be running over trillion-dollar deficits, and that is using the current GDP projections for the future, which we are going to talk about that model on the very end slide. There is something horribly wrong in how we are modeling our future income growth into this country.

The math is real. I know it is uncomfortable and it is almost sacrilegious to many of the political people here, saying: Well, we are not allowed to talk about that. David, why are you such a downer? Don't you want to get re-elected? Why aren't you doing happy talk?

I am optimistic about the country. I am optimistic about some things happening out there in the economy despite government. But you have to understand, in 9 years, interest will be \$1 trillion. And think about this: it is almost going to be approaching all discretionary. At that time, in 9 years, we will be about \$1.4 trillion in interest. Our best interest projection is over \$1 trillion.

The chart, when you go a couple years out, we will be spending more money on interest than all of defense, all of discretionary, all of education, all of parts, all of health research, everything else. That is what we are doing. We are creating this trap where, as we build more and more debt and build more and more debt and build more and more debt, that becomes our Achilles heel. That becomes our fragility in this country.

So once again, remember that earlier slide where I went over there and marked that now this year's deficit projection is \$582.5 billion, and that is coming from the White House as of about 2 days ago.

We had someone in our office earlier today. We were trying to do some modeling. If GDP continues to do what we think is happening right now, we could be having a discussion this coming October that the 2015 shortfall was almost \$600 billion. You do realize that is approaching double what the optimistic projections were last year for 2015.

There is something horribly wrong out there. It is a combination of lack of economic growth and, let's be honest, the mandatory spending, the entitlements, are growing faster than the underlying models we have built.

So this is an interesting slide just to give you the point of talking about inflection. It is a fancy word that a lot of the statisticians like to use, and we politicians will use it. But there it, and it has begun. We are well into it.

Do you see where those blue lines start to explode? But do you notice something interesting? The red lines, from about here over basically stay substantially flat. That is the discretionary spending. That is what we get to vote on. That is your defense. That is everything else other than the mandatory spending.

But what is exploding through the ceiling? It looks like Washington, D.C., failed to understand the demographic issues that were heading towards this country and systematically avoided them, because I am sure it had nothing to do with my brothers and sisters often caring more about their next election than having to go through the painful process of educating our voters to understand this is your greatest threat, I believe, to our Republic.

One more slide to put this in perspective. The blue line is interest. The red line is all—all—of defense spending. Do you notice something, that in about 7 years, 6½ years, we are now spending more money in interest than all of defense? All of defense. It is 6 years away.

Actually, in reality, my math is closer to 5½, but we will use the 6 years.

Think about that. We will be spending more money in interest on U.S. sovereign debt than we are spending on all defense of the Nation. It is absurd. And this is what we are about to hand to our kids. As a matter of fact, this is no longer about our kids. This is about us now. The numbers have eroded so fast, it is here. And the happy talk that we were doing just 1 year ago, particularly coming from the administration, has not turned out to be true.

So one of the things that is going on out there, can you regulate yourself to prosperity? Can you tax yourself to prosperity? Can you, in an arrogant fashion, have a bureaucracy that is so inept, its ability to even when we do bipartisan, pro-growth pieces of legislation like the JOBS Act—we all got together here 3 years ago and did the JOBS Act. You do realize there are still substantial portions of that piece of legislation that are still sitting at the SEC that still don't have their rules because of the underlying politics behind them? They are 3 years beyond their due date, but we still don't have them.

There is something horribly wrong in this government if we don't have an honest discussion and actually then do something about our Tax Code, our regulatory code, access to opportunity, and then the difficult one, the design within our entitlement state, which is something the Republicans for the last 4 years, 5 years, have been putting into our budget.

Do you all remember the television commercial of the PAUL RYAN look-alike throwing grandma over the cliff? Great politics, horrible math, because the Republicans, PAUL RYAN and the rest of us, stood up and said that we are willing to actually propose a model that saves Medicare and deals with this curve that consumes everything in our path. It is really bad politics; it is honest math. And we get the crap kicked out of us for telling the truth.

So now we get to look at a slide like this. We were projecting 3.1 percent GDP for this year. As of a few hours ago, the Atlanta Fed, which actually does this really interesting modeling of collecting current statistics and constantly adjusting their GDP projections, now has us not at 3.1 percent GDP for this year—and remember, every point of GDP is—it matters what velocity model you use—about \$80 billion to \$100 billion of revenue. So you start to realize that a couple of points of GDP is a big deal. The Atlanta Fed's GDP calculation on their Web site now is 0.7 percent GDP coming in in this quarter, and the indicators look like we are going to get additional downward revisions on the first quarter.

Mr. Speaker, we are in trouble. Yes, the politicians will get up here and blame each other and blame each other, but it doesn't make the math go away.

□ 1930

The other thing is also—and this is one of my pet peeves here—we systematically do not tell the truth, and this is a Republican and Democrat problem. Some of it is because we use really bad modeling data, really bad underlying statistics; we underestimate the swings during boom times and slowdowns. We systematically have blown our GDP calculation; but understand, that GDP calculation has a lot to do with what we model as our spending, has a lot to do with what ends up happening on our debt.

If you look at this chart, the red is what real GDP turned out to be; the blue was our projection, and systematically, we are dramatically under the projection. It looks like this year we are crashing and burning. I am desperately hoping the third quarter and the fourth quarter get really healthy, but there is something horribly wrong out there.

Is this administration, are my brothers and sisters on the left, finally willing to have that conversation about the Tax Code, about our regulatory state, those very things that—let's face it—are stymying future growth and our ability to save this country?

One last slide just to sort of provide an opportunity—for those of you who have an interest in watching some of these numbers, and there are those out there who are also sort of numbers geeks, this is that GDPNow. Yes, it is often a pessimistic calculator; except for the small problem is, the last couple of years, it has actually been the accurate calculator of actual GDP growth. This is right off the GDPNow Web site from the Atlanta Fed, showing it looks like, now, we are all the way down to a .7 percent GDP growth in the second quarter.

A little bit else on this and then I will stop this thing I am doing, which may be bordering on a tirade. If you are particularly geeky, last week, you would have seen the Journal of Economic Perspectives did an entire report on Social Security calculations.

There is a handful of folks here with all sorts of letters behind their names, mostly Ph.D., talking about Social Security is actually in worse shape than we tell people, that they are close to \$1 trillion additional underfunded in the latest projections, and that some of the modeling are simple things like we are actually using really bad life expectancy tables.

Now, I have incredible respect for the actuaries over at Medicare and Social Security; I think they deal with some amazing data sets, but some of the Nation's finest economists and Ph.D. economists are starting to write public articles, saying: We are in real trouble here.

Remember, last year, when the Mercatus did their detailed projection on unfunded liabilities and debt for the United States, they came in with a number that scared me half to death. They actually came in with a number

of \$205 trillion, as if you did GAAP standard accounting, not government accounting, standard accounting for the debt of this Nation and our unfunded liabilities.

Go on the Internet right now, and look up what is the wealth of the world. Some of the best models say the wealth of the world is about \$180 trillion. We have universities out there modeling that U.S. sovereign debt and unfunded liabilities are over \$200 trillion. Our unfunded liabilities are greater than the wealth of the world.

We are better than this. This is the greatest issue in front of us, and we spend so little time actually having an honest discussion about the math.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### CAMPAIGN SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIQUIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. McNERNEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk a little bit about spending today, like my friend and colleague from Arizona, but I am going to talk about spending of a different kind. I am going to talk about campaign spending.

Campaign spending is quite an issue, and I want to spend about an hour or less talking about its effect, and I want to talk about some of the solutions that we have out there that might make a big difference.

First, I want to say I truly believe in my heart of hearts that the United States of America is the greatest country in the world, probably the greatest country that the world has ever seen and may see in the future. You can just see that by some of the markers.

The notions of freedom that this country has had in the past have inspired nations; they have inspired individuals around the world. Our economic strength is unrivaled. Our cultural influence reaches every corner of the world. Our military power is absolutely unrivaled.

However, again, I truly believe that we can do better, and I will tell you some of the big challenges that we are facing right now, that if we take on these challenges, we will even be a greater Nation.

First of all, we need massive investments in our Nation's infrastructure, our highways, our bridges, our ports, our airports. We need it in our broadband. We just need a massive amount of investment in our Nation's infrastructure.

Our Nation's education is falling behind. Yes, we have some of the greatest schools, some of the greatest universities in the entire world, some of our public schools, some of our charter schools and private schools unrivaled; but there are a lot of schools that are struggling and producing students that really can't compete in today's world.

We need to do immigration reform. We have 12, 15 million people in this country that are undocumented that live in the shadows that may or may not pay taxes that contribute to our economy but are always afraid of being deported.

We have climate change. Climate change is here; it is progressing; it is going to get worse. We need to do something about it as soon as possible.

We have a vanishing middle class. There is a huge disparity in incomes between the richest and the poorest in this country, and it is increasing. Our middle class is vanishing. They are feeling more and more insecure. They are unable to send their kids to college. We have a huge challenge in that regard.

We have a need to establish background checks for purchase of weapons and to close the gun show loopholes.

We need to create a sustainable economy.

These are huge challenges that we need to attend from the Congress, from this body, from the House of Representatives, from the United States Senate, from the State legislatures, from local governments; but we are unable to attack these problems, in a large part, because of the way campaigns are financed.

Now, we see a growing perversion of Presidential campaigns. We have super-PACs. We have dark donors, and they are having meetings with Presidential candidates, which are allowed by the laws because the candidates are not official candidates.

No one knows what is legal and enforceable right now in Presidential candidate financing; and worse than that, foreign money is probably coming into all of these campaigns now.

I just want to say elections up and down the ballot are being more and more perverted each election. All Americans should be concerned.

While I was waiting to speak this evening, I just read an article in the National Journal Daily today that stated: "According to data gathered in 21 states by the National Institute on Money in State Politics, \$175 million was spent by them in 2006"—that is local politics; that is city council and school boards—"a number that ballooned to \$245 million four years later."

That is a delta of \$70 million increases in local campaign financing in just 4 years, and that is a fraction of the total expected to be spent in future local races.

Before I go further, what I would like to do is take a break and yield to my friend and colleague from North Carolina (Mr. JONES). He wants to say a few words.

Mr. JONES. Mr. McNERNEY, thank you very much, and I want to thank you for taking the lead tonight to be on the floor. I know you have other Members of Congress to join you in your hour, but I have been here for 20 years, and I must tell you that, since I

have been here, I have never seen as much influence by the special interests as I do now, and that is because of money.

Actually, both parties—and that is why you are a Democrat, I am a Republican—but both parties seem to succumb to the influence of money to get bills to the floor.

I am a strong supporter of JOHN SARBANES, who is from Maryland. You have your bill that I have joined today, by the way, to sign my name to your resolution, and I am on JOHN SARBANES' bill, which is H.R. 20. The title is the Government By the People Act.

I will touch on four quick points. One is building a government of, by, and for the people. The second part of the bill says empower the Americans to participate. The third part is amplify the voice of the people and then fight back against Big Money special interests.

In my few minutes, Mr. McNERNEY, what I would like to talk about is the influence of money. I am a Republican and proud to be one; you are a Democrat and proud to be one, but I will tell you that I have seen so many bills this year get to the floor of the House because, in my opinion, it is because of the influence of special interests.

You and I recently had a bill on the floor that basically said that we would change the law that would allow the mobile home companies that sell mobile homes—many people in my district, 45,000 people own mobile homes, and there will be others buying mobile homes—but they will change the contract to say that it would go from 8 to 12 percent.

Well, who did it benefit? It was Warren Buffett. I don't deny Warren Buffett his success. He is a very successful man, and I am happy for him. What this bill did was to say to the average person that maybe in California or North Carolina that needs to buy a mobile home, because that is the best they can do: we are going to let you pay more in interest.

I was the only Republican to vote "no" on that bill. I said this back in my district, and quite frankly, I was pleased that the majority of people agree with me that we should be considerate of those people who cannot afford to buy better than a mobile home; but there, again, that special interest influence, that is what you just said a moment ago.

I am of the firm belief that if we do not change the system—you have an H.J. Res. that you have introduced. I talk about JOHN SARBANES' H.R. 20. That will create an alternative to the system that we have.

You and I both know that Citizens United that said that a corporation is an individual has created a lot of the problems that we face today. I will say that the American people need to get behind what you are trying to do, what Mr. SARBANES is trying to do—and I, in a lesser way—to return the power of the people to the people because, too



many times, decisions here in Washington are made because special interests, whether it be a Democrat or Republican leadership, puts it on the floor.

I believe that the people, as you believe, have a right to let this be the people's House and not the special interests House.

I am delighted to be on the floor with you tonight. I will stay just a few minutes, if you want to call back on me in a couple of minutes. I will be here until a little bit after 8, but I wanted to thank you for getting on the floor tonight to speak about this issue because, if we are going to let the people own the government, then we must give the power back to the people.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Thank you, Mr. JONES.

I just want to point out, again, that this is bipartisan. Mr. JONES is a Republican; I am a Democrat. We both see the corrosive influence of money here in Washington, and we want to do something about it.

A lot of our colleagues agree with us wholeheartedly but are actually afraid to say it. They are afraid to get up here because they know, if they do, they are going to be targeted by this special interest money, by super-PAC money, by dark money.

The sad thing is that you don't know that it is coming. You could be running a good, solid, healthy campaign arguing the issues and, all of a sudden, see a \$2 million television ad against you, and they would be going after you for very personal misleading ads, which could destroy you and your family, for no reason other than you don't want to see so much money in campaign spending.

□ 1945

Let me look at some of the specific risks and problems that we see today because of the way campaigns are financed.

First of all, campaign financing makes elected officials less effective in their jobs because of the time you have to spend raising money.

Here in Congress, it is not unusual to see a Member of Congress spend 2, 4, 6 hours a day on the phone, begging people for money. That lessens your effectiveness. You can't spend the time you should be spending on studying legislation, in talking to colleagues, in finding ways to compromise on issues.

The second item is negative campaign ads turn off voters and suppress votes.

Boy, we saw in this last election a turnout of 40 percent, 35 percent, and 30 percent in some districts, and a lot of that has to do with the negativity that people see on TV. They don't know what to believe. They think they are both bums, and they just close their noses and vote for the least worse or they don't vote at all. That is the second.

The effect of campaign financing makes for wasteful government spending.

This is an issue that, I think, folks like my predecessor here tonight was talking about. The Tea Party folks should be interested in this issue because the way campaigns are financed causes wasteful government spending. Boy, I will tell you that I sympathize with the Tea Party objectives. Government seems big. It seems wasteful. It seems loaded. It seems ineffective. There is wasteful spending. There are projects that shouldn't be funded. A lot of that has to do with the way campaigns are financed.

The next one is a big one. This is important. It is kind of what I mentioned before. It is the threat of negative campaign ads causes elected officials to avoid important and controversial issues:

Now, I do not care if you are a Republican or a Democrat. If you are a Republican, you have risk in your primary elections. If you are a Democrat, it is of big money coming in and trying to trash you personally in election campaigns. If you are a Democrat, you have more risk coming in in general elections. So it doesn't matter what party you are in. It doesn't matter whether you are conservative or liberal. The way campaigns are financed is causing our government to be wasteful, and it is causing it to be ineffective. I think that needs to be improved.

There is another problem that I mentioned earlier. Foreign money is coming into these campaigns now. Do you want to see foreigners, do you want to see folks from Russia or from China or from any country besides the United States having an influence on our elections?

The amount of money coming into elections continues to grow election by election. We had \$6.2 million in 2010 versus \$3 billion in 2012. I think I have gotten a million or a billion mixed up there. Sorry about that. Elected officials respond more to wealthy donors than they do to nonwealthy donors. It is simply a matter of access. Someone gives you money, and they are more likely to have access, and that means that you are more likely to be sympathetic to their legislative goals.

Judicial races are getting more expensive and tainted as well. Do you want to have a judge in a case that you may be bringing to court to have gotten his seat or her seat because of the way the campaign finance trashed his opponent? I do not think so.

In general, people have become very cynical about government because of the negative advertising, and people lose faith in our government. To have the greatest country in the world and the things that this country has accomplished—the innovation, the science, the freedoms that we have established throughout the world—and then have people cynical about our government because of the campaign financing is more than a tragedy. Campaign spending is a zero-sum game. Let me tell you what I mean by that.

Consider that you are in a meeting. You have got a 1 hour, and you have

got 12 people, so everyone has 5 minutes to speak. Now, what if somebody takes 10 minutes? Then somebody else is going to lose out. Campaignspeak is like that too because people in this country are only willing to listen to a certain amount of campaign rhetoric, and then after that point, they turn off their minds. They don't want to hear any more. The folks with the biggest money get out there. They fill the airwaves, and they fill your mailboxes, and they have people knock on your doors. Pretty soon, you don't want to hear any more, so the guy with the lesser money is losing freedom of speech. So I think it is a freedom of speech issue. Those are some of the issues I have.

With PACs and Super PACs and dark money—this is an interesting one—campaigns are no longer going to be controlled by the candidates. You could have a situation in which Super PACs and PACs have five times more money than the candidate himself or herself, in which case they are controlling all of the levers in the campaign. So those are some of the issues that, I think, are caused by the excessive spending in our campaigns.

I again yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) to take up the case here.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate listening to you, and it reminds me of a conversation I had on the floor of the House last week.

As you know, I have been here 20 years. I came with Newt Gingrich, and Bill Clinton was the President. We did some good things for the American people, so I am kind of an older man, so to speak. I vote my conscience up here, and it gets me in trouble. I voted twice against the Speaker of the House, and it got me in trouble, but I do what I think is right.

I was sitting on the floor, and this gentleman—I will not say his name or where he is from because I don't have permission to do that. He came up to me and said, "Walter, I am probably going to—" He is 20 years younger than I am. I am 72 now. He said, "I am probably going to be like you," and he is a Republican. He said, "I will probably be like you and will never be a chairman or a ranking member of anything because I cannot do anything that would dampen or threaten my integrity."

I said, "What do you mean?"

He said, "Well, in January, I was told that I could be a subcommittee chairman, but I would have to raise \$300,000."

The point that you are trying to make tonight—and you are doing a good job—with JOHN SARBANES' bill, H.R. 20, which I hope people look up, as well as with your resolution, is that too oftentimes—and I will say in both parties—we have people in leadership who say you have to raise X amount of dollars if you want to be a chairman. What happens to that person in eastern North Carolina, where I am from, who



makes \$35,000 or \$40,000 a year who can't buy influence in Washington?

That is what you are trying to do tonight, and that is why I wanted to be with you, and I admire you for taking the floor tonight. Where are their spokesmen? We are the people's House, and all of a sudden, everything is about money, winning reelections with money—big money. The average citizens are beginning to be turned off by the fact that they don't have much influence, and that is why what you are doing tonight is very special.

I was thinking about the gentleman who said to me, "I will be like you, Walter Jones. I will probably never be a chairman or a ranking member because you are trying to keep your integrity in place." If we had a system that you are proposing and JOHN SARBANES is proposing that would have a system for those who don't want to be bought and paid for by special interests, they would have an alternative by raising their money in the State and in the district, and they would be rewarded for raising their money in that State. Then their allegiance would be to the State and the district.

Again, I am going to stay a few more minutes, but I want to compliment you on what you are doing tonight.

Mr. MCNERNEY. I thank the gentleman. I don't know of anyone who has more integrity in this institution than you do, so I am honored that you would come down here and talk with me tonight about this important issue.

Now, the American people, as far as I can tell, are clearly in favor of reducing campaign money, campaign spending. I have some Gallup Poll numbers here that were taken by The Huffington Post from November 7 through November 9, 2014, which was during the last election or right after the last election.

The first question:

Would you support or oppose amending the Constitution to give Congress more power to create restrictions on campaign spending?

In favor of that was 53 percent; opposed was 23 percent; and not sure was 22 percent. So it was a very strong majority in favor of a constitutional amendment like I am going to discuss in a little while.

The second question:

Do you think limiting contributions to political campaigns helps to prevent corruption in politics, or does it have no impact on corruption?

The question is will corruption be curtailed by limiting campaign spending. The answer that it helps prevent corruption: 52 percent; no impact on corruption: 28 percent; and not sure: 20 percent. Again, people feel strongly about this issue.

The last question that I will read is:

Which of the following statements do you agree with more: Elections are generally won by the candidate who raises the most money? The answer is 59 percent of Americans believe that; 18 percent don't believe that; and 23 per-

cent are unsure. So I think this is a strong issue that we should be talking about.

How do we move forward?

Unfortunately, the Supreme Court appears to have a strong bias toward more money in politics, and it has consistently issued rulings to that effect. The Supreme Court even sought out, they even asked for, the infamous Citizens United case to be brought forward to them. Then, ultimately, they ruled that corporations have the same rights—free speech—as individual citizens do, as individual people do. The meaning of that decision is that corporations can use their treasuries to finance campaigns.

I can't think of anything more corrosive or destructive to our democracy than that. The system was already bad before the Citizens United decision, but this thing made it much worse. Unfortunately, the Citizens United decision is just one of a series of decisions that allows more and more money into politics, and I truly believe that this is a threat to our cherished democratic and republican institutions.

This trend is not confined to the Supreme Court. Earlier this year, the Republican-controlled Senate, in concurrence with the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, passed legislation that increased the total individuals could contribute to political parties by a factor of 10—going from \$35,000 to over \$300,000.

What can we do about it?

The good news is that there are really a number of very good ideas that have been proposed, and I think it is important for us to go over some of those ideas. My friend WALTER JONES has mentioned JOHN SARBANES' idea, and I will go into that in a little bit of detail. But there are others, and I think it is important that the American people be aware of some of these proposals out there and what they might offer and to let them decide, let the American people decide.

Do they want to see a legislative approach like JOHN SARBANES' great approach?—I support it—or a constitutional amendment like mine and others that I will bring up as we go forward tonight? These proposals all have merit. They are all worth studying and thinking about, and I would be happy to support any of the ones that I am going to talk about this evening and to consider other ones that may not have been brought forward yet. The proposals, again, fall into two categories—legislative proposals and constitutional amendments.

Legislative proposals are a little bit easier to enact, but they are subject to Supreme Court and lower court overturning. So you can work hard, and you can get it passed and then have the Supreme Court or some other court overturn it. The constitutional amendment has a very high bar. It is very difficult to get a constitutional amendment passed, and it should be. You don't want people just willy-nilly pass-

ing an amendment to change the Constitution. It requires a two-thirds vote in the House of Representatives, a two-thirds vote in the Senate, and three-quarters of the State legislatures throughout the country to pass that amendment for it to become part of the Constitution; but once it becomes part of the Constitution, the courts can't touch it. They can interpret it, but they can't overturn it.

There is legislation that I would like to talk about, but some of my colleagues who were going to be here tonight couldn't be because of a change in schedule. I think one of the important approaches, mostly championed by CHRIS VAN HOLLEN from Maryland, is the disclosure and transparency approach, which is that people who donate ought to be disclosed quickly and broadly so that people know where money is coming from. That is a very important idea.

□ 2000

Also, Government By the People, JOHN SARBANES' approach, which I will talk about in a little while; and there is also legislation that would create public finance, and I think that is a very good approach, too.

There are two constitutional amendments, one by DONNA EDWARDS, a colleague of mine from Maryland, that overturns Citizens United, and there is one by TED DEUTCH, a colleague of mine from Florida. TED DEUTCH from Florida would basically allow Congress to enact laws on campaign financing that could not be overturned by the Supreme Court. I think that is a good approach. I support that. In theory, it has got a beauty to it.

Then there is my approach, which basically would eliminate PACs and do other things. I would like to talk in some detail about my resolution now, and we will get the board up to talk about it. This is called H.J. Res. 31, and again, it is a proposed constitutional amendment. As you can see, it has four parts.

The first part, I think, is probably the most important, and it says basically that money that comes in to political election campaigns to support or oppose a candidate for office can only come from individual citizens and only go to the campaign controlled by the candidate or the principal campaign controlled by the candidate or from a system of public election financing.

So what does that mean? That means that when money comes in, it can only come from individual citizens. It can't come from corporations; it can't come from any other sources. It just comes from individual citizens, and it can only go to the campaign controlled by the candidate. That means that it can't go to political action committees, PACs; it can't go to super-PACs; it can't be dark money. The only money that can influence elections directly or indirectly to support or oppose a candidate has to come from individual

citizens. It has to go only to the candidate, to the campaign controlled by the candidate. That is a very strong requirement. It is probably the strongest requirement out there right now, but I think it is important.

By the way, the first requirement applies to elections for individual candidates at all levels of government, from the President on down to the Congress, the Senate, State governments, city governments, and so on.

The second measure is similar to the first. This requirement, money to support or oppose a State ballot initiative to change a State constitution or for other purposes can only come from individuals who are able to vote for the measure or from a system of public election financing. I think that is important because you have ballot initiatives in my home State of California, for example, and you see millions of dollars coming in from out of State. Why would somebody from out of State have an opportunity to influence a State ballot initiative in California? I think it is wrong, and I think that this would take care of that problem.

The third requirement is that Congress, the States, and the local jurisdictions must establish limits that an individual can contribute to any one election campaign, including limits on the amount a candidate may contribute to his or her own campaign. Now, for that particular requirement, we already have that in the U.S. House and U.S. Senate. The limit at this point in time is \$2,700 per election. So every time your voters can go to the booth for you, people can contribute, individuals can contribute \$2,700, so the primary election and the general election. In the House of Representatives elections are every 2 years, so you can collect an amount of \$5,400 over the election cycle for your campaign.

Now, if you collect \$5,400 before the primary and you lose the primary, then you are going to have to give back the money that was donated for the general election. So that would be you would have to give \$2,700 back to the donors that gave that to you.

Also, it is important that it requires governments to limit the amount a candidate can spend on their own campaign. Some of our candidates are extremely wealthy. They have millions or hundreds of millions or more. They can buy their seat in Congress easily, and this would limit that. I think, again, this is very, very important.

The last is probably one of the more controversial of the four, but it says that the total of contributions to a candidate's campaign from individuals who are not able to vote for the candidate cannot be greater than the total of contributions from individuals who can vote for the candidate. Now, geographically what that would mean is that money coming from outside of your congressional district, or from your State if you are a Senator, can't exceed money that comes from inside your district if you are a congressional

candidate or State if you are a Senator. It wouldn't affect the Presidential race as much because everybody in the United States is in the President's district, but it would also affect local districts as well. With that, that wraps up the discussion of my proposed constitutional amendment.

I want to talk a little bit about JOHN SARBANES' bill, and I think it is a fine bill. It is not a constitutional amendment. What it does is it gives you a tax credit for money that you can contribute to a campaign. So if you can contribute \$50 to a campaign, then you get a tax credit of \$50, which means money back on your income tax return; the same amount that you contribute, you get back. But also it matches that contribution by 6 to 1. So you will end up giving the candidate quite a bit more than you are actually contributing. It is a good measure. It is a good proposal. It would sort of even out the effect of PACs. I find myself supporting that.

Again, my colleague, TED DEUTCH, has a couple of constitutional amendments in the 114th Congress. One of them is called Democracies for All, H.J. Res. 119, and also H.J. Res. 22 that creates funding limits and creates a distinction between individuals and corporations, but what it really does is allows Congress to limit, to enact laws that will be enforceable and not overturned by the Supreme Court.

We have VAN HOLLEN in the 114th Congress, H.R. 430, and what this does is it requires disclosure so that when campaign contributions are made, we can determine who made those contributions—very important. I think it would make a big difference.

Then we have a number of proposals to create public financing. My colleague from Kentucky, JOHN YARMUTH, had one in the 113th Congress, Fair Elections Now Act. In the 114th Congress, which is this Congress, DAVID PRICE has H.R. 424, which establishes a system of public financing.

These are all good. I think I would be supportive of any of these kinds of approaches. I think the American public needs to be protected. I think our cherished Democratic and Republican institutions are a threat here, whether it is because candidates are bombarded by negative ads, whether it is because candidates are influenced by big donors, whether it is because more and more money is coming in to these elections every single cycle. There is a lot of reasons why we need to look at campaign financing and select one of these approaches and go with it and change the system that we have to a system that really does respond to the American public.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CHAFFETZ (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance

of the week on account of an unscheduled medical procedure.

Mr. DONOVAN (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of the birth of his first child.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2252. An act to clarify the effective date of certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 20, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1517. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement, pursuant to Sec. 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, on a transaction involving Gunes Ekspres Havacilik A.S. of Antalya, Turkey; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1518. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, Department of Commerce, transmitting the second quarterly report from the National Telecommunications and Information Administration regarding the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority transition, pursuant to the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, Pub. L. 113-235; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1519. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final order — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Extension of Temporary Placement of UR-144, XLR11, and AKB48 in Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act [Docket No.: DEA-414] received May 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1520. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to Israel, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, Pub. L. 94-329, as amended, Transmittal No.: 15-36; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1521. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a list of international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States, to be transmitted to Congress within sixty days in accordance with the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1522. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting pursuant

to Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1523. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1524. A letter from the Director, Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting seventeen reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1525. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the Chairman's Semiannual Report on Final Action Resulting from Audit Reports, Inspection Reports, and Evaluation Reports for the period of October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1526. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a report providing a FY 2016 Estimate for the Free Clinic Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 233(o); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1527. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the "2014 Biennial Report to Congress on the Effectiveness of Grant Programs Under the Violence Against Women Act", as required by Sec. 1003(b) of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1528. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Depreciation of Precious Metals (Rev. Rul. 2015-11) received May 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1119. A bill to improve the efficiency of Federal research and development, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 874. A bill to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1156. A bill to authorize the establishment of a body under the National Science and Technology Council to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation opportunities (Rept. 114-123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1158. A

bill to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, facilitate public-private partnerships, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1162. A bill to make technical changes to provisions authorizing prize competitions under the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980; with an amendment (Rept. 114-125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1561. A bill to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STIVERS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 273. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2262) to facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 880) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and providing for proceedings during the period from May 22, 2015, through May 29, 2015 (Rept. 114-127). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BYRNE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 274. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1335) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-128). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 6. A bill to accelerate the discovery, development, and delivery of 21st century cures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 2405. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the special expensing rules for certain film and television productions and to provide for special expensing for live theatrical productions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself, Mr. WALZ, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2406. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 2407. A bill to reverse declining milk consumption in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. LEE, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 2408. A bill to establish in the Administration for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services the Federal Interagency Working Group on Reducing Child Poverty to develop a national strategy to eliminate child poverty in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 2409. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow small businesses to defer the payment of certain employment taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFazio (for himself, Ms. NOR-  
TON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIREs, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. TITUS, Ms. ESTY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California) (all by request):

H.R. 2410. A bill to authorize highway infrastructure and safety, transit, motor carrier, rail, and other surface transportation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Science, Space, and Technology, Natural Resources, Oversight and Government Reform, the Budget, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 2411. A bill to support early learning; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WELCH, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 2412. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the credit for residential energy efficient property and the energy credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr.

MESSER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr.

BUCSHON, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 2413. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 601 South Main Street in Elkhart, Indiana, as the "Staff Sergeant Jesse L. Williams Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. LONG, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 2414. A bill to facilitate the responsible communication of scientific and medical developments; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 2415. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for establishment of a streamlined data review program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2416. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to evaluate the potential use of evidence from clinical experience to help support the approval of new indications for approved drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 2417. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish fair and consistent eligibility requirements for graduate medical schools operating outside the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DOLD (for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. ROSS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 2418. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to reduce the fuel economy obligations of automobile manufacturers whose fleets contain at least 50 percent fuel choice enabling vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2419. A bill to amend the Public Health Services Act to reauthorize funding for the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2420. A bill to reduce administrative burdens on researchers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2421. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase accountability at the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2422. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to third-party quality system assessment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2423. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to valid scientific evidence; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2424. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to training and oversight in least burdensome appropriate means concept; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2425. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the recognition of standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2426. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to easing regulatory burden with respect to certain class I and class II devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2427. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect

to advisory committee process; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2428. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to humanitarian device exemption applications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KIND, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 2429. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any discharge of income contingent and income-based student loan indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 2430. A bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 2431. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for job training expenses of employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 2432. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a gender equality-focused investment option under the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2433. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to enhancing combination products review; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MARINO, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 2434. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2435. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with regard to the Reagan-Udall Foundation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 2436. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to appropriate age groupings to be included in research studies involving human subjects; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2437. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act regarding high cost durable medical equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2438. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to broader application of Bayesian statistics and adaptive trial designs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2439. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Silvio O. Conte Senior Biomedical Research Service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 2440. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve loan repayment programs of the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 2441. A bill to award a Congressional gold medal, collectively, to the 1st American Volunteer Group of the Chinese Air Force, also known as the AVG Flying Tigers, in recognition of their service to the nation; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. LEE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 2442. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2443. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to CLIA waiver study design guidance for in

vitro diagnostics; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2444. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Food and Drugs to award grants for studying the process of continuous drug manufacturing; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2445. A bill to express the sense of Congress with respect to enabling Food and Drug Administration scientific engagement; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2446. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require the use of electronic visit verification for personal care services furnished under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2447. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for an NIH research strategic plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2448. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a program of high-risk, high-reward research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BASS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 2449. A bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. PETERS, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 2450. A bill to prohibit, as an unfair and deceptive act or practice, commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 2451. A bill to amend title 23 and title 49, United States Code, to strengthen domestic content standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. SCHRAEDER, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 2452. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to facilitating dissemination of health care economic information; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2453. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to authorize the National Capital Planning Commission to designate and modify the boundaries of the National Mall area in the District of Columbia reserved for the location of commemorative works of pre-eminent historical and lasting significance to the United States and other activities, to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services to make recommendations for the termination of the authority of a person to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 2454. A bill to provide for the public disclosure of information regarding surveillance activities under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2455. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to precision medicine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2456. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure the sharing of data generated from research with the public; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 2457. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the work opportunity credit to small businesses which hire individuals who are members of the Ready Reserve or National Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself and Mr. SCALISE):

H.R. 2458. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5351 Lalapco Boulevard in Marrero, Louisiana, as the "Lionel R. Collins, Sr. Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2459. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to enhance the reporting requirements pertaining to use of antimicrobial drugs in food animals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 2460. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 272. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LEE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. GRIJALVA,

Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H. Res. 275. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Asian and Pacific Islander HIV/AIDS Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H. Res. 276. A resolution honoring the National Association of Women Business Owners on its 40th anniversary; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself and Mr. HASTINGS):

H. Res. 277. A resolution honoring the Tunisian People for their democratic transition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H. Res. 278. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should initiate negotiations to enter into a free trade agreement with Tunisia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 6.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 2405.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause I, Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 2406.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2—The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States

Amendment II—A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 2409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8; Sixteenth Amendment

By Mr. DeFAZIO:

H.R. 2410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 2411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 2412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 2413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Per Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes. Per the Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Per Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes. Per the Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Per Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes. Per the Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. DOLD:

H.R. 2418.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution states that Congress has the authority to "regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states."

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution states that Congress has the authority to "regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states."

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution states that Congress has the authority to "regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states."

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 2429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause I of Section VIII of Article I.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 2430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations

respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state."

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 2431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 and Clause 18 of Section 8, of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 2432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 or Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 2440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 2441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

" . . . and provide for the . . . general welfare of the United States . . . "

" . . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers . . . "

This legislation seeks to award the Congressional gold medal, collectively, to the 1st American Volunteer Group of the Chinese Air Force.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2442.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2443.



Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of

the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 2449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 2450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which allows Congress to regulate commerce among the several states.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 2452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clauses 14 and 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 2454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 2457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 (General Welfare Clause)

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 (Territories Clause)

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for this bill stems from Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 2460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 9: Mr. FINCHER and Mr. AMODEL.  
H.R. 21: Mr. RIBBLE.  
H.R. 67: Mr. JEFFRIES.  
H.R. 167: Mr. DESAULNIER.  
H.R. 169: Mr. BENISHEK.  
H.R. 224: Mr. JEFFRIES and Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
H.R. 226: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.  
H.R. 232: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. CLEAVER.  
H.R. 244: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.  
H.R. 303: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. DEFAZIO.  
H.R. 343: Mr. WITTMAN.  
H.R. 353: Mr. ABRAHAM.  
H.R. 382: Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
H.R. 402: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. FARENTHOLD.  
H.R. 427: Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 429: Mr. COHEN.  
H.R. 483: Mr. PETERS.  
H.R. 532: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. SERRANO.  
H.R. 539: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. BEYER.  
H.R. 540: Mr. ROUZER.  
H.R. 542: Mr. HIMES.  
H.R. 555: Mrs. NOEM.  
H.R. 556: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DENT, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.  
H.R. 564: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.  
H.R. 572: Mr. OLSON.  
H.R. 578: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. BOUSTANY.  
H.R. 581: Mr. UPTON.  
H.R. 628: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 672: Mr. BLUM and Mr. NOLAN.  
H.R. 700: Mr. YARMUTH.  
H.R. 721: Mr. HILL.  
H.R. 761: Ms. MATSUI.  
H.R. 767: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. CLEAVER.  
H.R. 784: Mr. NADLER.  
H.R. 785: Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GARAMENDI.  
H.R. 793: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
H.R. 815: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois, and Mr. BENISHEK.  
H.R. 816: Mr. BRAT and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.  
H.R. 838: Mr. ALLEN.  
H.R. 863: Mr. UPTON, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 879: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. BUCSHON.  
H.R. 913: Mr. KEATING and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.  
H.R. 923: Mr. PALAZZO.  
H.R. 924: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.  
H.R. 969: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. CRAWFORD.



- H.R. 980: Mr. TAKAI and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 985: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. HULTGREN.  
H.R. 986: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. POMPEO.  
H.R. 999: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.  
H.R. 1002: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. PETERSON.  
H.R. 1062: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.  
H.R. 1087: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.  
H.R. 1089: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. HANNA.  
H.R. 1141: Mr. WESTERMAN.  
H.R. 1174: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.  
H.R. 1175: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. LIPINSKI.  
H.R. 1188: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. POE of Texas.  
H.R. 1192: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. PASCRELL.  
H.R. 1194: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
H.R. 1197: Mr. HONDA, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. RICHMOND.  
H.R. 1221: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.  
H.R. 1225: Mr. KING of New York.  
H.R. 1234: Mr. LAUDERMILK.  
H.R. 1258: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 1271: Mr. WALZ.  
H.R. 1283: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.  
H.R. 1284: Mr. CUMMINGS.  
H.R. 1299: Mrs. ROBY.  
H.R. 1300: Mr. LOBIONDO.  
H.R. 1312: Mr. RUSH and Mr. QUIGLEY.  
H.R. 1320: Mrs. LOVE.  
H.R. 1338: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DENT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. LOBIONDO.  
H.R. 1343: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. TAKANO.  
H.R. 1350: Mr. DONOVAN.  
H.R. 1384: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. WITTMAN.  
H.R. 1393: Mr. SIRES.  
H.R. 1398: Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 1399: Mr. HONDA and Mr. LOBIONDO.  
H.R. 1401: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. POMPEO.  
H.R. 1404: Mr. QUIGLEY.  
H.R. 1413: Mr. ALLEN.  
H.R. 1421: Mr. QUIGLEY.  
H.R. 1450: Mr. BEYER.  
H.R. 1453: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.  
H.R. 1462: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HINOJOSA.  
H.R. 1475: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
H.R. 1492: Mr. BERA and Mr. NOLAN.  
H.R. 1496: Mr. PETERS.  
H.R. 1516: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BOST, Mr. GIBBS, and Miss RICE of New York.  
H.R. 1519: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. NOLAN.  
H.R. 1549: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.  
H.R. 1550: Mr. MEEKS.  
H.R. 1552: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. KUSTER.  
H.R. 1555: Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. WESTERMAN.  
H.R. 1559: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. WELCH.  
H.R. 1567: Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. NOLAN.  
H.R. 1571: Mr. WALZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HONDA, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.  
H.R. 1598: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SIRES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.  
H.R. 1604: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 1618: Mr. LOEBSACK.  
H.R. 1622: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 1635: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
H.R. 1644: Mr. MESSER.  
H.R. 1671: Mr. BLUM and Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 1675: Mr. HURT of Virginia.  
H.R. 1683: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. LEE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. ROUZER.  
H.R. 1684: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 1718: Mr. BOUSTANY.  
H.R. 1736: Mr. ASHFORD and Mrs. HARTZLER.  
H.R. 1737: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. PALAZZO.  
H.R. 1739: Mr. POSEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. NUGENT.  
H.R. 1745: Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
H.R. 1752: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.  
H.R. 1769: Mr. KATKO and Mr. KING of New York.  
H.R. 1777: Mr. GROTHMAN.  
H.R. 1805: Mr. AMODEI.  
H.R. 1810: Mr. HONDA.  
H.R. 1817: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. POSEY, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MERCHANT, and Mrs. BLACK.  
H.R. 1833: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
H.R. 1843: Ms. ESHOO.  
H.R. 1853: Mr. MARINO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FORBES, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. HASTINGS.  
H.R. 1861: Mr. ROKITA.  
H.R. 1876: Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 1877: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
H.R. 1886: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. STIVERS.  
H.R. 1899: Mr. MEEKS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. WELCH.  
H.R. 1919: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.  
H.R. 1920: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
H.R. 1921: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
H.R. 1942: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. MENG, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.  
H.R. 1974: Mr. SIRES.  
H.R. 1977: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
H.R. 1992: Mr. WEBER of Texas.  
H.R. 1994: Mr. DESANTIS.  
H.R. 2008: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. YOHO.  
H.R. 2014: Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 2017: Mr. HOLDING, Mrs. Mimi Walters of California, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. KIND, and Mr. LANCE.  
H.R. 2046: Mr. KIND.  
H.R. 2061: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.  
H.R. 2072: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. TAKAI.  
H.R. 2076: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. HUFFMAN.  
H.R. 2077: Mr. ROUZER.  
H.R. 2093: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 2100: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HANNA, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BASS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
H.R. 2156: Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.  
H.R. 2169: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 2191: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
H.R. 2205: Mr. ROYCE.  
H.R. 2110: Mr. BERA and Mr. BYRNE.  
H.R. 2227: Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 2243: Mr. BLUM.  
H.R. 2247: Mr. MCKINLEY.  
H.R. 2259: Mr. MESSER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.  
H.R. 2267: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. MESSER.  
H.R. 2268: Mr. LEVIN.  
H.R. 2270: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. HUFFMAN.  
H.R. 2272: Mr. RIBBLE.  
H.R. 2276: Ms. WILSON of Florida.  
H.R. 2300: Mr. MESSER, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.  
H.R. 2302: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
H.R. 2304: Mr. MARINO.  
H.R. 2306: Mr. MESSER and Mr. OLSON.  
H.R. 2315: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. STIVERS.  
H.R. 2316: Mr. PEARCE.  
H.R. 2330: Ms. BASS.  
H.R. 2331: Mr. PEARCE.  
H.R. 2351: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 2354: Mr. POSEY.  
H.R. 2371: Mr. MCNERNEY.  
H.R. 2372: Ms. MOORE.  
H.R. 2393: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. NUNES, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. COLE.  
H.R. 2394: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.  
H.R. 2403: Mr. JOYCE.  
H.R. 2404: Mr. DEFazio.  
H.J. Res. 9: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.J. Res. 13: Mr. BABIN.  
H.J. Res. 22: Mr. TED LIEU of California.  
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.  
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.  
H. Con. Res. 40: Mrs. COMSTOCK.  
H. Res. 12: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. PETERSON.  
H. Res. 16: Mr. BRAT.  
H. Res. 17: Ms. STEFANIK.  
H. Res. 28: Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BOST, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WELCH, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. PETERSON.  
H. Res. 54: Mr. MARINO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. NADLER.  
H. Res. 130: Ms. FUDGE.  
H. Res. 194: Mr. NOLAN.  
H. Res. 233: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. POLIS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. TROTT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. MEEKS.  
H. Res. 249: Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.  
H. Res. 256: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. YODER, and Mr. POCAN.  
H. Res. 259: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

#### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative DINGELL or a designee, to H.R. 1335, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative SMITH of Texas or a designee, to H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

**DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM  
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1909:

Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. THORNBERRY.